NOVEMBER 1952 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Is the Spiritual Tide on the Turn?—Lord Samuel's 'Religion in the Modern World'—Causes of the Modern Landslide—The Biblical Doctrine of Conversion—Mercenary Motives in the Production of the English Bible—New Testament Textual Criticism 33

II. THE MARXIST INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY: IS IT SCIENCE? By H. G. Wood, D.D., Birmingham 36

III. LITERATURE 40

IV. BOOKS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST: CREED'S ESSAY IN 'MYSTERIUM CHRISTI.' By the Reverend John Stewart Lawton, M.A., B.D., D.Phil., Padiham Vicarage, Burnley 46

V. BELIEVING AND EVERLASTING LIFE—A JOHANNINE INQUIRY. By the Reverend William Turner, B.D., Gargunnock 50

VI. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 52
2. The Christian Year 53

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 61

VIII. ENTRE NOUS—Worship in the Day School: 4. The Conduct of Worship—St. Anselm . 63

VOLUME LXIV. No. 2

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

CHRISTIAN BELIEF TO-DAY

CONTRIBUTORS

J. W. C. WAND, D.D., Bishop of London
The Scheme of Salvation
W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's
Problems of Christian Belief
V. A. DEMANT, D.Litt., Canon of Christ Church
Man and the Social Order
LINDSAY DEWAR, B.D., Canon of St. Albans
Personality and Human Relations

In this important book the four eminent authors offer their wise counsels to all who wish to understand the challenge of Christianity and the Church to the present generation.

Just Published. **15s.**

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ACTS

BISHOP PHILIP LOYD

The late Bishop Philip Loyd, author of *The Way According to St. Mark* and other books, left some unpublished writings of much value. The commentary on the Acts is among his best work.

Just Published. **5s.**

THE CLOUD AND THE SILVER LINING

EMILE CAMMAERTS

The Silver Lining broadcast talks on problems of suffering are a household word to a wide public. Professor Cammaerts analyses the information that has come in to the B.B.C. as a result of them. His book should be read by all interested in the social conditions of our time.

Just Published. **5s.**

MORE OUTLINE SERMONS ON GENERAL SUBJECTS

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, D.D.

A further selection of Outlines, including one appropriate to the coming Coronation.

Just Published. **3s. 6d.**

MOWBRAYS

28 MARGARET STREET, W.1

REFORMATION WRITINGS OF MARTIN LUTHER

Translated with introduction and notes by
Bertram Lee Woolf

Dr. Lee Woolf has done great service to the study of Luther in this country by making the most significant of these writings available in a new translation. His introductions and explanatory notes make clear their historical context.

27s. 6d. net

THE MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE CHURCH

Emil Brunner

In this monograph, Professor Brunner addresses himself vigorously to the question: What is wrong with the churches? He seeks an answer in the contrast between the virile Spirit-filled fellowship of the New Testament and the institutions which are called "churches" to-day.

10s. 6d. net

THE FRUITS OF CONTROVERSY

Edward Langton

The theme of this book is a timely one—the winning of our civil and religious liberties. Dr. Langton gives a lucid and often vivid account of the struggles and suffering of Puritan and Covenanter through which many of our liberties were won.

15s. net

LUTTERWORTH PRESS

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

Is the spiritual tide on the turn? Or are we still watching the ebb? It is uncommonly hard to tell. Some months ago we met a distinguished Cambridge Professor who was quite sure that, so far as the students of Cambridge were concerned, and despite the influence of Wittgenstein and the Logical-positivists, there were clear signs that the 'flow' had begun. Only the other day we encountered a veteran Scottish minister who was of the same opinion. Never in his ministry of forty years had he known larger congregations. A young theological student, just back from a year in the States, reported to us enthusiastically on the vitality of church and religious life in America.

But we must be cautious in drawing conclusions. These are but random pieces of evidence. One swallow—or even three—does not make a summer. We should need many more bits of such evidence before we could safely generalize. That there is a revived interest in theology, that an ecumenical Church, transcending our denominational differences, is struggling to be born, and that the Bible, despite much Biblical illiteracy, is still the world's best seller, these are incontrovertible facts. But how stands it with the rank and file of the people? Are they beginning again, after catastrophe and disillusionment, to turn back to God and religion?

In one of his recent 'Spectator' causeries that charming essayist, Mr. Harold Nicolson, has been relating his disagreement with 'a gifted newspaper proprietor' who averred that three things could always be counted on to arouse the interest of the great British Public—money, health, and religion. Mr. Nicolson would leave religion out. 'I admitted,' he explains, 'that a hundred years ago men and women of distinction and ability were much preoccupied by problems of theology: that the days and nights of such estimable men as Dean Merivale and Arthur Hugh Clough were saddened by perplexities regarding The Thirty-Nine Articles and the doctrine of original sin. I doubted, however, whether more than five per cent. of the modern generation ever gave such subjects a thought.'

We should not wish to quarrel with Mr. Nicolson, so far as the phrasing of the last sentence is concerned. Possibly not more than five per cent. of our fifty millions shows an active interest in the two subjects he mentions. But if he means that no more than two and a half millions in this island seriously care whether 'there is a Friend behind phenomena' or not, and whether Jesus of Nazareth was indeed what He claimed to be, the unique Son of that great Being, we should demur. As for the other point—original sin—we should have thought that the catastrophes of our times had posed the problem of evil for our generation more sharply and starkly than ever before. (We remember the late Bishop Neville Talbot saying, about 1940, that his talks with students in Junior Common Rooms had shown him that the one thing they were utterly sure about was the fact of sin.)

It was on top of these reflections that we came upon two essays about the present state of religion by that wise elder statesman, Lord SAMUEL, himself a Jew—in *Religion in the Modern World*.[1] Lord SAMUEL attributes the modern landslide in religion to three things—science, war, and tolerance.

The last may sound a strange reason. Lord SAMUEL'S point is that, in past centuries, the dominant religion being established by authority, doubt was impious, and dissent was penalized. Once the principle of toleration spread, creeds became matters for open discussion, and men realized there were other religions besides the one established in their own land, spiritual ties were inevitably relaxed. You could dare to dissent, and even disbelieve—and 'get away with it.'

The other two causes are undeniable, and more important. The two bloody World-Wars of our time and their miserable aftermaths have beyond any doubt given religion 'a bad knock.' Men have asked the bitter question, 'If God is love, why are there such wars?' and, finding no clear answer, have gone over into unbelief. (Lord SAMUEL rightly says that the problem of war is part of the bigger problem of evil, and that this in turn raises again the immemorial controversy about determinism and free-will. He argues that 'the cosmic plan' [he does not say 'God'] left room for the

[1] Allen and Unwin; 7s. 6d. net.

possibility of evil when It created men with free will rather than perfect automata, that we ought not to blame the Devil for our sins, and that evil is the responsibility of man rather than God.)

That modern science, especially the very materialistic sort which flourished at the beginning of the century, has been a solvent of religion, is familiar ground which we need not cover here. 'But,' says Lord SAMUEL, 'in the last few years there have been signs of a change.' The limitations of mechanistic science have been exposed. There are far fewer 'materialists' among the physicists. The whole conception of a dying sun and a doomed cosmos has been challenged. And, in short, there is 'one sure conclusion—that the picture of the universe given us by science, the factual universe that we perceive, physical and mental together, cannot be all that there is. It is not a closed system. It is not self-created. It does not explain itself. Evidently there must be something else.'

What then, humanly speaking, are the prospects for religion? If we can preserve the peace of the world, and if science continues on the new path it seems to be taking, the conclusion would seem to be (on Lord SAMUEL'S premisses) that the outlook may reasonably be expected to grow brighter.

All this, of course, is to argue the matter on the level of human possibilities. It amounts to comparing religion to a tender plant which may be expected to flourish if no severe storms (wars) set back its growth, and the atmosphere (scientific) proves to be genial. It really reckons without another factor which no Christian can leave out—God. The Christian man will take higher and more hopeful ground. Believing in a living and holy God, who is at the helm of history, a God who is working out His purpose, even in the travail of our times, to a great End, he will be persuaded that if men will but realize the folly of their present ways, which cannot but incur what Paul calls 'His Wrath,' seasons of refreshment from on high must come and the winds of God's healing Spirit sweep the world. It is not given to him to say when that will happen; but he will work and pray for its coming, and will greet all evidences of man's return to God and the gospel, however insignificant, as 'the flags of dawn' proclaiming that 'the day is near.'

In the autumn number of the *Scottish Journal of Theology* there is a grave and serious article on 'The Biblical Doctrine of Conversion,' by the late Professor Julius SCHNIEWIND. The translation is by the Rev. Dr. Bernhard Citron. In the Old Testament 'conversion is turning back to God.' Now a man's highest good *is* his God. For some it may be Mammon; for others it may be honour or reputation; but fundamentally it is *self*. Luther is quoted as saying, 'All evil is only a symptom; the real disease lies in the fact that we have another god; the other god is called *I*.' It is 'God Himself who converts us and God Himself is the cause of our return.' The history of Israel—and of the world—is the history of men turning away and God turning them back, 'the story of man's unfaithfulness and God's faithfulness.' In the New Testament the word *repent* really means *be converted*. Literally, as far as the Greek goes, it means a change of mind. But, 'much more is at stake than just a change of mind. Certainly to get a new heart is implied too, but our actions also are involved even to the smallest and the least; and above all our relationship to God is at stake and not merely a change of our Self.' In the New Testament baptism implies first of all death, and then re-creation by the Holy Ghost.

Professor SCHNIEWIND has a very interesting interpretation of Mk 8^{34}: 'Whosoever will come after me let him deny himself.' This is usually connected with self-discipline and self-renunciation. But Professor SCHNIEWIND connects it with Peter's denial when he said of Jesus, 'I do not know the man.' 'To deny one's Self is to say of oneself, "I do not know the man." It means to hate one's own life and it means to let not the left hand know what the right hand does, that is to say, not to know one's own self and one's own works (Mt 6^{3}).'

There is joy in conversion. There is the joy in heaven; there is the joy of the banquet feast; and there is the joy of the children of the bride-chamber. Above all, there is the joy of what Luther called 'the joyful exchange' when we realize that Jesus Christ gave His life a ransom for many, 'in exchange for the lost life of others.' But there is also sackcloth and ashes, for there is penitence, and penitence involves sorrow. And since life and death are at stake there is a certain threat in the matter which means that all things must be abandoned to win entry into the Kingdom. The repentance which comes to us is not repentance for *sins* but for *sin*. Again Luther is quoted, 'this is not a beggarly piecemeal repentance, like that of those who repent only of sins committed, for true repentance does not question what is sin and what is not sin, but throws all into one and says that everything in us is sin.' 'Repentance is to accept the death-sentence and

the acquittal of God.' Such repentance and conversion may be sudden; it may be a process; but in a certain sense it must be always continually repeated because 'Christianity can never be taken for granted,' but must be continuously re-realized. 'There is love at first sight; and there is slowly awakening love. In both cases it is necessary to keep fresh that which was given to us once; and that means to gain it anew, as if this were the first day.' The supreme question is, 'How can I get a merciful God?' and the great way is 'to ignore the Self and to count on Christ alone.' It must be said that this article is so rich and compact with Biblical theology at its best that no summary can do it justice.

The current issues of certain American periodicals contain articles of considerable interest. In *The Anglican Theological Review* there is an article on the curious and unusual subject of 'Mercenary Motives in the Production of the English Bible in the Early Sixteenth Century,' by Charles F. NESBITT. It is usually assumed that the motives which led to the translation and distribution of the first English printed Scriptures were of the highest; but occasionally it has been suggested that 'the whole vast business of translation and publication, importation and distribution, buying and selling of the Scriptures in sixteenth-century England and on the Continent was largely in the spirit of commercial venture and greed for private gain.' Mr. NESBITT completely absolves William Tyndale from all participation in, and even knowledge of, all this commercialism, but he holds very strongly that it was there. Between 1525 and 1536 some fifty thousand copies of the New Testament were printed and the cost must have been in the neighbourhood of £10,000, a sum which must be multiplied by four or five at least to gain a figure comparable with present-day monetary standards.

Where did that money come from? Mr. NESBITT holds that behind Tyndale were the 'Merchant Adventurers' of London, who financed the business not for love of the New Testament but for love of money. These men had strong trade connexions on the Continent. Their connexions and their own outlook were strongly Lutheran; but they were Lutheran in no small part because they knew 'that the Church had seriously hampered trade and commerce in the past and had retarded economic development in England by her vast holdings and worldly practices.' It has been estimated that the Church held one-third of the wealth of the country in her hands. . . . The yearly rental of her properties was established by Henry's own commissioners about 1530 as more than £320,000, which, says Mr. NESBITT, was equal to an enormous sum of present-day money. The distribution of the New Testament in English would break the power of the Church; therefore the Merchant Adventurers financed it. That there were adventurers ready to seize on all this as a commercial undertaking is shown by the fact that when Tyndale and Roye were preparing to print their first New Testament in Cologne a Roman Catholic called Peter Quentel was quite ready to print it on proper financial terms. Cochlæus, the Roman Catholic enemy of Tyndale, declared that Tyndale's venture was 'abundantly supplied by English merchants.'

The oddest of all commercial ramps was that it does seem that when the bishops began burning the New Testament the financiers began deliberately selling them New Testaments to burn! Archbishop Warham spent £1000 buying New Testaments only to burn them. Packington, one of the Merchant Adventurers, arranged to sell copies to Tunstall, Bishop of London, that they might be burned. Herman van Rinck was commissioned by Wolsey to buy up New Testaments in Frankfurt and presented a bill of £1300. Of the Packington transaction the comment is quoted, 'And so forward went the bargain. The Bishop had the books, Packington had the thanks, and Tyndale had the money'—with which, of course, to print more Testaments! It is, of course, true that more than one printer did try to issue pirated editions simply to make money. It is also true that more than one of the Coverdale editions got into England by a trick. Henry the Eighth had passed legislation prohibiting the importation of foreign books into England. The Coverdale editions were printed in Zurich, but the 1535, 1536, and 1537 editions had a new title page inserted into them printed by James Nicholson of Southwark and were legalized by that trick. Mr. NESBITT believes that Thomas Cromwell was involved in all this. In 1538 he issued injunctions that every one of the eleven thousand English parishes should procure a Bible. There seems to be evidence that Cromwell had invested about £800 in the printing of the Great Bible and chose this way to make a handsome profit. Mr. NESBITT even goes as far as to say that Henry the Eighth himself was involved in this financial manipulation and that that was why he so readily gave his permission for the printing of the Bibles of 1537 and 1539. It would be one of the oddest facts in all history if the distribution of the English Bible was partly an act of Christian piety and devotion and partly the result of a gigantic ramp of shrewd speculators.

The Journal of Religion has a really important article on 'The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism and Appraisal,' by Professor M. Parvis of Chicago University. 'The object of Textual Criticism, when applied to the Scriptures of the New Testament, is to determine what the Apostles and Evangelists of Christ actually wrote—the precise words they employed, and the very order of them.' A further object is 'to construct the history of the transmission of the text down to the invention of printing.' It has to be asked, Why should it be necessary to do this at all?

There are four main periods in the history of Textual Criticism. First, there was the period when the 'traditional' text was being formed. Now that was a period when scribes not only transmitted but to some extent interpreted the text. If they found a word which was original but which might be misunderstood then they did not hesitate to alter it; it was a period when in fact not so much the *original* text but the *correct* text was sought. In other words the really binding tests were theological tests. Second, there was the period when a theory of verbal inspiration held the field. In a way the Reformation was responsible for this because for an infallible Church it substituted an infallible Bible. On 25th November 1860 Dean Burgon from Christ Church pulpit in Oxford gave this its classical statement. 'The Bible is none other than *the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne*! Every Book of it—every Chapter of it—every Verse of it—every syllable of it—(*where* are we to *stop*?)—every letter of it—is the utterance of the Most High! . . . The Bible is none other than *the Word of God*: not some part of it, more, some part of it, less; but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne; —absolute—faultless—unerring—supreme!' With such a point of view it is obvious that the original text must be discovered. Third, there followed the period when the aim was to get back to 'the religion of Jesus.' It was very natural that there should be associated with that a desire to get back to the original text and to strip it of all accretions. Fourth, there is our present age. What in it should be our attitude? Textual criticism threatens to become art for art's sake, or, what is much worse, art for the artist's sake.

Now Dr. Parvis rightly insists that the New Testament documents are essentially not historical but religious documents. He holds that in fact the traditional text, and, for that matter, the original text, was but the stereotyping of one line of tradition. Therefore variant readings have this great and supreme interest—that they are the products of the tradition of some part of the Church. No matter when they arise, even as late as the twelfth century, they all contribute to our knowledge of the history of Christian thought. A variant reading will often tell you what interpretation some one, or some church, gave to a particular passage. There then emerges the paradoxical truth that the variant readings which are often contemptuously dismissed are of the greatest interest and importance for the light they shed on the interpretation of Scripture in some great thinker's mind. Manuscripts, versions, lectionaries are not simply to be classified as types and 'families' and pure and mixed and so on; 'they reflect the beliefs, the doctrines, and the worship of their times and places.' They are the result of the fact that Scripture was not a dead corpus, until printing came, but that it was alive. In other words, the textual critic must not approach the documents as things of antiquarian interest; 'they are the voice of the Church down through the centuries.' It is not too much to say that this article may well mark an epoch in our attitude to textual criticism.

The Marxist Interpretation of History: Is it Science?

By H. G. Wood, D.D., Birmingham

Perhaps the fairest estimate of the contribution of Karl Marx to the study of history is that offered by Croce, who says that Marx has not given us a philosophy of history or even a scientific account of the process or processes of history, but he has drawn attention to a vast mass of hitherto neglected material. History has usually and wrongly been equated with political history, and Marx showed that you cannot write political history if you ignore the economic basis of society and the factor of economic change. He went further and declared that you cannot write the history of culture or of any department of culture, you cannot write church history, unless you take into account the economic factor. This main feature of the Marxist interpretation of history every modern historian would accept, and so far all moderns are content to sit at the feet of Karl Marx, to recognize his greatness and to acknowledge their debt to him. If we quarrel with the Marxist interpretation of history, it will not be to question the emphasis on the economic factor, but to question the interpretation

of the economic factor itself and of its relation to other factors. Again, if 'the materialist conception of history'—the title adopted by Marx—means merely 'realist,' 'objective,' or 'positive,' then the modern historian will have no quarrel with the Marxist on this score. If he criticizes the Marxist, he will do so on the ground that like some other 'realists' the Marxist is not 'realist' or 'positive' enough. The Marxist interpretation professes to be realist and objective, it is actually selective and subjective.

Any consideration of the subject must start from the fundamental proposition which Engels attributes to Marx and which he declares underlies the Communist Manifesto. It runs as follows:

> 'That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class-struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions, and class struggles.'

This proposition cannot be regarded as self-evident and it is not free from ambiguities. That it should give rise to misconceptions was perhaps inevitable and is certainly natural. I am not sure, however, whether some alleged misconceptions are not legitimate interpretations. R. H. Tawney once protested against the grotesque misconception of Marx's theory of history and of politics, which suggests that, 'by some mysterious process of squaring intellectual circles, he made a theory of the processes of history do the work of a political philosophy.'[1] But I should have thought that there is in the famous proposition precisely that confusion of a theory of the processes of history with a practical political philosophy, of which Tawney claims that Marx was not guilty. Marx's theory of the processes of history is derived from his political philosophy, and his political philosophy is presented as the outcome of his theory of the processes of history. If this be squaring intellectual circles, then Marx himself is responsible for this mistaken and misleading form of mental activity.

[1] Review in *New Statesman and Nation*, November 9, 1935.

The most important ambiguity in the proposition as stated by Engels is the description of the economic basis of society as that '*from which alone* can be explained the political and intellectual history of any epoch.' 'From which alone'—does this mean by which you can completely explain, or without which you cannot explain? In the latter sense, all modern historians accept the proposition. In the former sense, the followers of Marx have constantly interpreted it. Engels himself recognized the ambiguity and sought to remove it, repudiating many Marxist interpreters in the process. The passage from his letters must be cited before we submit the Marxist theory to a closer examination.

> 'According to the materialistic conception of history, the production and reproduction of real life constitutes in the *last instance* the determining factor of history. Neither Marx nor I ever maintained more. Now when someone comes along and distorts this to mean that the economic factor is the *sole* determining factor he is converting the former proposition into a meaningless, abstract, and absurd phrase. The economic situation is the basis but the various factors of the superstructure—the political forms of the class struggles and their results—constitutions, etc., established by victorious classes after hard-won battles—legal forms, and even the reflexes of all these real struggles in the brain of the participants, political, jural, philosophical theories, religious conceptions which have been developed into systematic dogmas, all these exercise an influence upon the course of historical struggles, and in many cases determine for the most part their form.'

In a later paragraph of the same letter he admits frankly that the authors of the Communist Manifesto were in part to blame for misconceptions.

> 'Marx and I are partly responsible for the fact that at times our disciples have laid more weight upon the economic factor than belongs to it. We were compelled to emphasize its central character in opposition to our opponents who denied it, and there wasn't always time, place, and occasion to do justice to the other factors in the reciprocal interactions of the historical process. But just as soon as it was a matter of the presentation of an historical chapter, that is to say, of practical application, things became quite different; there, no error was possible. Unfortunately it is only too frequent that a person believes he has completely understood a new theory and is capable of applying it when he has taken over its fundamental ideas—and even then in an incorrect form. And from this reproach I cannot spare many of the recent "Marxists." They have certainly turned out a rare kind of tommy-rot.'

It will be seen that these passages resolve the ambiguity of the phrase 'from which alone' in a

sense which makes the proposition more palatable to the modern historian. ' It is not the case that the economic situation is the *sole active cause* and everything else only a passive effect. But there is a reciprocal interaction within a fundamental economic necessity which in the last instance always asserts itself.' This insistence on the importance of the given conditioning economic milieu we can all recognize as valid.

Yet even so, Engels is claiming too much for it. For there is another difficulty in the proposition which is not so far cleared up. The economic basis consists of the prevailing mode of production and exchange and the social organization *necessarily* following from it. But does any social organization *necessarily* follow from the prevailing mode of production and exchange ? Max Weber has shown in his *General Economic History* that very different forms of social organization may be associated with essentially the same modes of production and exchange. If the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange be regarded as something purely technical, it may no doubt tend to set up a certain type of social organization. Thus, the use of power-driven machinery involves factories and factory organization, and such factory organization as is technically necessary will tend to be reflected in social organization. The large-scale factory will tend to the formation of distinct groups. But within the limits of organization which the mode of production tends to set up, the outlook of the groups and their relations one to another may vary enormously. The proposition appears to regard all actual social organization as the necessary resultant of the technical mode of production. There is no reason to believe this to be true. A particular example cited by Engels himself may serve to illustrate the point. ' The foundations of the law of inheritance . . . are economic. None the less it would be very hard to prove that, for example, the absolute freedom of testamentary disposition in England, and the strongly restricted right in France, in all particulars have only economic causes. Yet both methods react in a very significant way upon the economic system in that they influence the distribution of wealth.' It would certainly be very hard to prove that such differences in the law of inheritance depended on differences in the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange in England and France respectively. If then the phrase ' prevailing mode of production and exchange ' be taken in a purely technical sense, no actual social organization can be fully explained as the necessary outcome of such technical factor. The actual social organization of any given place and time always has other than economic determinants. If, on the other hand, we read something more into the phrase, if, for instance, we describe latifundia run by slave-labour as the prevailing mode of agricultural production in Italy in the time of the Roman Empire and the manor run by serf-labour as the prevailing mode in Western Europe in the early Middle Ages, then the social organization which is supposed to be the effect of the mode of economic production is already included in the cause to which it is traced, and we are left with the tautological assertion that the social organization of any given epoch is the necessary outcome of its social organization. In short, the Marxist distinction between the prevailing mode of production and exchange, and the existing social organization is artificial and unscientific. The assumption that the existing social order at any epoch is the necessary outcome of the mode of production, etc., is a persistent feature of Marxist theory. It lacks justification, and it leads to constant confusion.

The proposition that the social organization, the laws, political ideas and institutions, science, philosophy, and religion of any epoch are simply the reflex of the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange has certainly never been proved. Terms like Feudalism and Capitalism are constantly used in the double sense of (1) a mode of economic life, and (2) a social order presumed to be its necessary outcome. Assertions are then freely made which are true of the second sense and assumed to be true of the first sense. If the existing social order be described as Capitalism, then obviously imperialist wars are a feature or result of our present social order. This truth or rather truism is then supposed to justify us in tracing wars to Capitalism as a mode of production and exchange. An analysis is submitted by way of demonstration, but it will not carry conviction to any critical mind. Marxists would explain wars as due to the needs of the capitalist system, either to the need for new markets or the need for new fields of investment or simply to the need to solve unemployment. This overlooks the fact that a given community may really need, or conceive itself to need, to control sources of raw material. A country under Socialism is just as likely as a country under Capitalism to undertake imperialist wars for its economic security. For this reason the U.S.S.R. has been as imperialist as any Western democracy. The doctrine that social organization is the necessary outcome of the economic basis of society is not true. What is true is that the influence of the economic basis and of changes in the economic basis is all pervading, and conditions definitely all sides of social life.

When the first clause of the proposition is rightly understood, when the phrases ' necessary outcome ' and ' from which alone ' have been subjected to critical examination, we are next faced with the

curious non-sequitur of the word 'consequently' which links the second clause with the first. Because social organization is determined in part by economic technique, the whole of history has been the record of class-struggles between exploiters and oppressed. The word 'consequently' is justified neither by logic nor by history. The influence of the prevailing mode of production and exchange is evidenced in many other ways than the formation of classes with conflicting interests. The Marxist is faced with this dilemma. If the formation of classes with conflicting interests is the only or the chief effect of the economic factor, then the economic factor explains very little in history. If, on the other hand, he is right as to the all-pervading influence of the economic factor, then he must trace back to it much more than the class-stratification of society. To take one example, nationalism and the organization of states on the basis of nationality are either related to, and in some measure determined by, the economic mode of production and exchange or they are not. If they are not, the most significant feature of nineteenth and twentieth century European history is not the necessary outcome of the economic factor. If they are, then class-stratification and class-struggles are not the only, and probably not the most, important resultant of our mode of producing and exchanging wealth.

Again, in so far as conflicts of economic interest play a part in history, those conflicts do not appear to be normally class-conflicts; and when they are class-conflicts, they are not conflicts between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed. Conflicts between different factions belonging to essentially the same class, conflicts between town and country, between landowners and merchants or manufacturers, conflicts between the commercial classes of different nations—all these have played a more important rôle in history than slave-risings or peasant-risings, which have rarely been successful and have usually been symptomatic rather than creative. Nor is there any necessary succession of such conflicts between oppressors and oppressed, or any necessary succession of slavery, serfdom, wage-labour, to be followed by a dictatorship of an emancipated proletariat. The actual changes from slavery to serfdom and serfdom to wage-labour, owe something, and in the case of the second transition much to changes in economic technique, but comparatively little to revolutionary violence or to wars waged to effect social change. If this critical analysis of the famous proposition be correct, the very important truth it contains is seriously misinterpreted not only by Marxists but by the authors of the proposition. Any attempt to understand history in terms of the proposition is bound to be misleading. For the trained historian it will suggest clues to the interpretation of events which he will gladly follow up: the uncritical amateur will simply be blinded by it and most Marxist historians are uncritical amateurs.

In spite of Engels' warning, Marxists continue to treat the exaggerations of the famous proposition as sober statements of scientific truth. In a recent booklet on *Marx and Science*, Professor J. D. Bernal makes extravagant claims for Marx as scientist. 'Starting from the observation and practice of the most difficult of [sciences]—the science of human society in its development—[Marx] had come to comprehend the whole range of sciences.' Professor Farrington in a Foreword endorses this view. 'Marx should rank not only as the founder of the science of history but as founder also of the history of science, for in his immense perspective they appear as two aspects of one science. Marxism operates in the world to-day not only to shift the balance of political power, but to redraw the frontiers of knowledge.' Professor Bernal summarizes Marx's achievement in these terms. 'The great discovery of Marx was that the ultimate motive force of history, of human social development, was not to be found in abstract ideas or mystical intuition. It lay in the very process by which men made their living—the productive process by which they got food, clothing, and shelter. Production, social from the outset, brought with it social productive relations leading to the appearance of rival classes. Their conflicts, which form the significant part of history, can be followed in unbroken sequence to the present day and beyond it, and are the source of the intellectual productions of human culture.' This summary is illustrated by two typical quotations from Marx. 'Religion, family, state, law, morality, science, art, etc., are only particular ways of production and fall under its general laws,' and 'history is nothing but the succession of the separate generations, each of which exploits the materials handed down to it by all preceding ones, and thus on the one hand continues the traditional activity in completely changed circumstances and on the other modifies the old circumstances with a completely changed activity.' The careless phrasing of the first sentence dispels the illusion that Marx wrote with any kind of scientific accuracy. Religion, law, morality, science, art, etc., may reflect particular ways of production, clearly they are not merely particular ways of production. To identify them with ways of production is the height of absurdity. And if Marx had known Engels' qualification of the proposition which states the principle of historical materialism, he would never have said 'history is *nothing but* the succession of the separate generations,' etc. The critical analysis

of the proposition shows conclusively that Marx did not found a genuine science of history and did not provide a scientific account of human society in its development. Professor Bernal should have been alive to this when he found science among the intellectual productions of human culture which are supposed to have their source in class-conflicts. Does Professor Bernal really believe in bourgeois science and proletarian science ? Does he suppose that there are no standards of truthfulness and thoroughness in scientific observation and research, which are the same for bourgeois and proletarian ? Does science change its essential character if society's ways of production change ? If Professor Bernal recognizes that there are standards of intellectual honesty binding on all men at all times in the pursuit of knowledge, then he must admit that to regard class-conflict as the source of science is just nonsense. If there is objective truth in science, if, for example, our knowledge of the structure of the atom is the same whether we use it for destructive or productive ends, or if the knowledge of poisons is the same whether we use it to heal or to hurt, then science cannot be only the reflection of class-interests or of a particular way of production. Science transcends class and is not so bound up with ways of production as to be subject to its general laws, whatever that may mean. Particular ways of production have their source in science rather than science in particular ways of production. But if the Marxist thesis is untenable with regard to science, it is impossible to treat science as the one exception and to insist that all the other intellectual productions of human culture have their source in class-conflicts or are nothing but parts of or reflections of the productive process. There is more in religion, family, state, law, art, literature, etc., than is dreamed of in Marx's philosophy. It is strange that gifted scientists do not see that Marxism undermines the integrity of the scientist and misunderstands the nature of science itself.

Literature

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY

The Christian Society, by Bishop Stephen Neill (Nisbet ; 17s. 6d. net), is a worthy addition to the important series (Library of Constructive Theology) to which it belongs. It is not a particularly original book, and is perhaps excessively cautious in holding the balance between opposing opinions, but it covers competently a long period of church history, and extracts useful guidance from the past for the present situation and the immediate future.

Bishop Neill shows a spirit of invincible but not extravagant optimism. He is quite aware of the depths of disillusionment after a period of apparent triumph, but the fundamental and recurrent miracle for him is that the Church has not only survived Dark Ages but has steadily expanded, until to-day Christianity is the only religion which can claim to be in actuality a world-wide religion. He cannot conceive of Christianity as individualistic, but he prefers to speak of the Christian Society rather than of the Christian Church, because of the controversial implications of the latter term. A little piece of autobiography indicates a link between him and a slightly older contemporary, Principal A. G. Hogg of Madras. In their most recent books (Dr. Hogg's is ' The Christian Message to the Hindu ') both of them suggest that in the course of their missionary experience they have come growingly to realize the importance of the Christian Society as well as of the individual in the evangelization of India. Bishop Neill's treatment in general of ecclesiastical history is illumined by his service in India, but is inspired also by his wide reading and genuine scholarship, as well as by his present main activities. He is refreshingly free from ecclesiastical presuppositions, and, although his own nearer loyalty is unmistakable, he is uniformly successful in his attempt ' not to obtrude the viewpoint of one Christian communion or of one individual.'

Although he allows that the word ' church ' occurs only in two New Testament passages he is firmly convinced that it was the purpose of Jesus Christ to found a new society, and he sets forth this position conclusively in the first chapter. That the universality of the Christian society was stressed from the very beginning may be admitted, but one might hesitate, in view of certain recent signs of racial discrimination, to accept the generalization that ' no one within the society has ever dared to deny in principle the truth as set forth by Paul.'

In showing the development of the Christian society, the author does not seek to impose any *a priori* Hegelian or Marxian pattern, and he is more than doubtful of the doctrine of the inevitability of progress. History simply will not fit in to a ready-made doctrinaire scheme—he speaks, for example, of the emergence of Islamic power as an ' unexpected and utterly unpredictable happening ' ; but he vividly sets forth the roundabout influence it had on the unfolding of Christian

thought. The tension between Church and State is ever-recurring, and the danger of a too close alliance is repeatedly emphasized. His treatment of the incursions of Henry VIII into Anglican ecclesiastical history is particularly interesting and it may be mentioned that this matrimonial adventurer has a more favourable verdict passed upon him as regards his policy than is usually the case. The four centuries succeeding the Reformation do not yield very adequate synthetic treatment, but it must be admitted that the material is very intractable.

The chapter on the relation of the faith to the great religions of the East is a brilliant piece of work, and treats very judicially the difficulties of accommodation on the one hand and a self-conscious distinctiveness on the other. On the whole the Bishop seems to be in favour of greater effort towards extracting the religious significance of the cultural inheritance of the various younger churches, and it is encouraging to find that the 'offence' of the gospel and the point of view represented by Kraemer and Barth is not now regarded as the whole truth of the matter. In another chapter we are given an exceedingly interesting disquisition on the problems created by mass-conversion, and the distinction between individuality and personality is used as a solvent of some of them. The general attitude shown in the ecumenical movements is warmly welcomed, and the establishment of the United Church of South India is given a restrained but genuine benediction. One is glad to know that such a man, as Bishop Neill in this book proves himself to be, is now so closely associated with the activities of the World Council of Churches.

W. S. URQUHART

CONFUCIANISM AND TAOISM

Dr. Max Weber was Professor of Economics successively at the Universities of Freiburg, Heidelberg, and Munich. Before his death in 1920 he had published three volumes of a series, intended, as the title shows, to be all-inclusive—'The Economic Ethic of the World Religions, Comparative Essays in the Sociology of Religion.' Volume I, at least partly written by 1913, contained an introduction which can be found in English translation as Chapter XI, 'The Social Psychology of the World Religions,' in the volume of essays entitled 'From Max Weber' (Kegan Paul [1947]). There followed, in Weber's original Volume I, an approach, such as the introduction described, to Confucianism and Taoism. This part of the *magnum opus* is now presented to English readers in a volume called by the translator, Professor Hans H. Gerth, *The Religion of China* (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.; $4.50; and Allen and Unwin; 32s. net). Of the eight chapters, one is a reprint from the book of essays. The title is misleading. To quote the earlier essay volume, it should have been described as 'comparative empirical studies of the relations of religious movements and the economic order,' with, in this case, Confucianism and Taoism as the objects of study.

The translator 'feels encouraged' because he has been told that his English is more readable than Weber's German. This may be readily believed from the evidence of survivals, such as this, Weber's definition of 'sib' (evidently a unit of society like the clan): 'gentile charismatically outstanding agnatic descendants of charismatic chieftains.' That three letters should mean so much!

Not only 'gentile' and 'charismatic' (above), but 'prebend,' 'liturgical,' and 'Puritanism' have meanings for the sociologist which bear no, or little, relation to their Christian use. How much more must one depend upon the glossary for 'chrematistic,' 'apotropaic,' 'mystagogue,' 'pennalism,' 'synoecism,' and 'peripety'!

Dr. Weber's knowledge of things Chinese was immense for one who, as the translator admits, 'was no sinologist.' There are, naturally, some misunderstandings and mis-statements: Lao-tzu seems to teach 'love of one's enemy' (p. 162), but the inner meaning of the Chinese is disregard of him. The Emperor Wu Tsung in 845 persecuted Buddhism (and, we may add, Christianity), not inspired by 'Confucian wrath' (p. 159), but because of Taoist zeal. China before 1842 'confined foreign contact to a single port,' not 'for the sake of preserving tradition' (p. 15), but because the pioneers of the new sea-ways in the early sixteenth century had behaved like pirates off China's coasts. The section on the T'ai P'ing Rebellion (pp. 219–224) is marked by such insight as to make one regret that Weber had not access to all the material now available. He seems to underestimate directly Christian elements in its origin, though no one could criticize as an understatement his judgment on the rebellion as an opportunity for the Christian religion, 'incomparably greater than that offered by the hopeless missionary experiments of the occidental denominations. And it may well have been the last opportunity for such a religion in China.' A curious misprint in the first page of notes (p. 250) refers to Williams' 'The Middle Kingdom' as 'The *Midden* Empire.'

Is it justifiable to translate now a book on China forty years old? It means the omission of the rise of Chinese literary and historical criticism, represented by such men as Dr. Hu

Shih and Professor Y. L. Fung; omission too of Chinese sociologists and economists of the modern school. It means no reference to the excavations, and the discovery of oracle bones, resulting in the driving back of the historical period into that which was, till recently, only legendary—the Shang dynasty of the second millennium B.C. The translator is not unaware of this, but his additions of brief notes, as on pp. 263 and 274, are but meagre compensation.

With all these disadvantages, should forty years have been judged too long a time? If the book were true to its title, I should unhesitatingly say, Yes. To do so, however, would be to forget the setting from which these studies have been lifted. The translator, the publisher informs us, is even now at work on Weber's sections on Hinduism, Buddhism, and Judaism. Seen as part of an ambitious plan to subject religions of the whole world to scrutiny under certain sociological principles, the book may well stimulate others possessing, not indeed capacities for such vast comparative work as Weber's, but specialist and up-to-date knowledge of the China field, so that what R. H. Tawney says of Weber's 'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' may be true here too, and later advance in understanding may 'have Weber as its starting point.'

JOHN FOSTER

ECUMENICITY

An admirable book on the Ecumenical Movement has appeared by Professor L. A. Zander—*Vision and Action: The Problems of Ecumenism* (Gollancz; 18s. net.). Its merit lies not in its clear account of what has been already achieved, that has been done before, but in its candid exhibition of the slow progress made towards any realization of what so many over-optimistically regard as the aim of the whole Movement—the reunion of the divided Christian churches. That may well be the far-off Divine event to which things are tending, but it does not seem to be much nearer. The author reminds us that one great Church, the Roman, is just not interested and takes no part, and that another, the Orthodox, while interested enough to send delegates does so with considerable doubt. But further he reminds us early in the book that many Christians have no great sense that the divided state of the churches is any real disadvantage to the progress of the Kingdom of God; and yet again that each separate church is convinced that it itself is most nearly right, and cherishing its own tradition expects the reunion of Christendom to be by way of the others crossing over to join it.

The author suggests that the Movement blundered when it took as its slogan *UNA*, and would advance far more hopefully if for that it were to substitute *tota Christianitas*. That would inspire, and probably would lead to, action which could be impressive.

For the basic points of unity among many branches of the Church the author has great enthusiasm, and no less for ecumenicity as exhibiting that. If we do not misunderstand him, however, his book is a warning against following 'wills-o'-the-wisp.'

It is a most interesting as well as informative work, the author's knowledge of various 'traditions' being encyclopædic.

The work is delightfully translated by Natalie Duddington, and the Bishop of Chichester writes an 'Introduction.' W. D. NIVEN

MARTIN LUTHER

The definitive Weimar edition of Luther's works was begun almost seventy years ago at the time of the fourth centenary of the great reformer's birth and, though some eighty volumes have been issued, there are still a few more to come. Where the body of material is so vast it was inevitable that English readers should know Luther only in translated selections. Unfortunately the selection and the translation were not always of the best. The most scholarly production was the single volume 'Luther's Primary Works,' edited by Wace and Buchheim. It contained the Ninety-five Theses of 1517, the Short and Great Catechisms of 1529 and the three principal treatises of 1520—the Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, The Liberty of the Christian and The Babylonish Captivity of the Church. It was a great service to the English-speaking student to have all this readily available; but from the standpoint of to-day even Wace and Buchheim is not all that could be desired, especially as their text lacked the critical precision now available in the Weimar edition. It is therefore a pleasure to receive *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther*, translated with Introduction and Notes from the Definitive Weimar Edition by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf, Volume I, *The Basis of the Protestant Reformation* (Lutterworth Press; 27s. 6d. net).

This volume includes the three great treatises of 1520 just mentioned and the Ninety-five Theses, together with a sermon and three letters of the period following the Theses; and in addition a short Exposition of the Decalogue, the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer. This last also belongs to 1520 and it is worthy of a place beside the better-known works of that crowded year. It is a fresh and vigorous handling of fundamentals—'the Decalogue teaches a man to know what is

wrong with himself . . . the Creed shows and teaches him where to find the medicine . . . the Lord's Prayer teaches him to yearn for this grace, to seek it and take it to heart.'

This is stated to be Volume I, and we are not told how many others are in view, but we look forward to their appearing and trust that through them not students of the period only but the general reader will get to know Luther better.

The present volume has an appendix giving a chronological table of Luther's writings and contemporary events; and there is an index each for personal names, subjects and Scripture references and allusions. Dr. Lee Woolf's Introduction and Notes are invaluable to the student and his translation is eminently readable. The publishers also deserve credit for putting out this attractive volume of four hundred pages at what must nowadays be reckoned a reasonable figure. This is the new Wace and Buchheim, and in this case one cannot say that the old is better.

STEWART MECHIE

A CAROLINE DIVINE

A fully annotated volume called *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor*, by Canon C. J. Stranks, M.A., M.Litt. (S.P.C.K.; 25s. net), uses much new material and looks like being the definitive biography of the author of that devotional classic, 'Holy Living and Holy Dying.' It is written with distinction and charm and in an eirenical spirit, with the conviction that the Anglican Fathers have not received the attention they deserve from a generation interested in Barthianism, Thomism, and even Counter-Reformation thought.

Taylor lived in times when controversy usually meant persecution. His first patron, Laud, with his passion for the unity of the Church, and for achieving it by liturgical uniformity, has left a name on the one hand honoured as a chief source of the High Anglican tradition, and on the other execrated as the director of the ruthless harrying of Puritans by the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. A victim whose ears had been cropped in the pillory lived to compass the execution of the pious tyrant in his old age after his fall. Taylor, one of whose earliest publications was a fine plea for toleration, became later the agent of a suave but relentless attempt to suppress Ulster Presbyterianism. And the mind of Presbyterianism was no less ruthless. That same appeal for toleration was greeted on its appearance by a violent attack by Samuel Rutherford, who is best remembered now by the hymn 'The sands of time are sinking,' which is a cento from his letters. The saintly minister of Anwoth had become a Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews, and he marshalled all the most bloodthirsty texts of the Old Testament in support of his argument for persecution, in the course of which he hesitates only to make the decision whether fire or the rope is the most appropriate instrument of death. The biography is a record of how this studious, erudite, able and deeply pious churchman lived, on the whole quietly, through these times, in the diligent service of religion with a blameless personal reputation, and achieved a copious output of theological prose, ornate with delicate fancy and weighted with an enormous range of quotation.

Taylor has received very high praise for his use of English, being placed by Coleridge beside Bacon, Shakespeare, and Milton. As a theologian even Canon Stranks admits that his importance may not be so great. He certainly put his vast reading at the service of the Anglican thesis that the primitive Church and its usages gave a model for a Church neither Roman nor Puritan. But Canon Stranks himself says 'nothing in itself very original is to be found in Taylor's works'; 'he was always ready to revise his views'; 'he was given to making contradictory statements'; and, apart from his maintenance of 'Apostolic Succession' and repudiation of Calvinistic predestination and Roman transubstantiation, 'it would not be easy to find any other major theological position to which he adhered throughout his life with complete whole-heartedness.'

This scholarly work abounds in human touches. One is the allusion to the fact that its origin was in Canon Stranks' habit of taking with him as travel companion on slow and interrupted journeys as a missionary in Japan one or other of the ten closely printed volumes of Taylor's collected works. He gives the explanation of the style of preaching in Taylor's day when he describes the incessant drill of school-boys in Latin composition and reading and in the practice of illustrating rhetorical themes by classical quotations that had been compiled and memorized for use as required, and of adding weight by excerpts from Latin and Greek. The seventeenth century had an unsatiable appetite for such sermons. The market was deluged by them and it was a profitable one.

One of the most entertaining things is the extract from his funeral sermon. Since Canon Stranks' book convinces us that, in spite of its Irish exuberance, it is on the whole true, it may be quoted. 'This great prelate he had the good humour of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a counsellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel and the piety of a saint. He had devotion enough for a cloister, learning enough for a university, and wit enough for a

college of virtuosi; and had his parts and endowments been parcelled out among his poor clergy it would perhaps have made one of the best dioceses in the world.' R. W. STEWART

Freud's theories seem still to be centrally important in the history of psychoanalysis, but there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction, and Miss Clara Thompson, M.D., in *Psychoanalysis: Evolution and Development* (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net) traces usefully the phases of the revolt which has taken place during the last fifty years. According to her thinking, however, 'revolt' is too strong a term, as Freud has often been misunderstood and unjustly blamed, largely owing to his own fault and his obstinate clinging to doctrines which were not after all the main part of his contribution. But much of his teaching undoubtedly cries out for modification, and the view of this book is that these modifications have been for the greater good of psychoanalysis.

The general tendency in recent years is shown to be opposed to Freud's exclusive emphasis on sexual urges. In him, and owing to his influence, the conceptions of the *libido* and the Oedipus complex have been over-worked. The aims of his therapy are too negative, and should be directed not only to release from unpleasant tendencies but to the development of advantageous potentialities which have been neglected. Attention in the classical Freudian school has been directed too much to the past history of the individual and not sufficiently to his current situation and his goals. On the whole, greater stress ought to be laid on environmental and interpersonal relationships rather than on the original biological constitution. In agreement with other recent writers Dr. Thompson lays emphasis on the importance of the character of the analyst, and discusses both the value and the dangers of his active participation in the problems of the patient. Here the book would be of use for pastoral guidance. The value of Jung's mystical and religious trend is well brought out, and a very important part of the book is the exposition of Fromm's treatment of the tragic freedom and equally tragic loneliness of the modern man as compared with his earlier inhibitive bondage to his society.

A better arrangement of topics would have increased the value of the book.

The Infinite Way, by Mr. Joel S. Goldsmith (Allen and Unwin; 8s. 6d. net), is dedicated 'to you to whom this already belongs.' The reviewer is not one of them. We find it a hard book, not easily understood.

Some idea of it may be gathered from some of the Contents—Our Real Existence, Soul, Meditation, Prayer, Metaphysical Healing, Supply, The New Horizon, The New Jerusalem.

A valuable new contribution to the study of Neoplatonism is presented by Dr. Philippus V. Pistorius, who is Professor of Hellenistic and Patristic Greek in the University of Pretoria, in *Plotinus and Neoplatonism* (Bowes and Bowes; 21s. net). It is modestly sub-titled 'An Introductory Study' but it is considerably more than that. It deals with many points of the thinking of Plotinus and illumines all — his views on psychology, the problem of evil, ethics, aesthetics, gnosticism, time, and eternity. The author has mastered all important work on Plotinus already done and has criticisms to offer as well as acknowledgments to make. The most interesting and important original contribution is, we think, the new view expounded of what has usually been termed the 'Triad' of Plotinus. According to the author the Plotinian view is that Ultimate Reality is not a graded Triad but much more a Trinity—'The One' exalted beyond all thought and predication; 'Nous' God in teleology, 'Psyche' God immanent in Creation. Each presupposes the others, so that we have an approach to the conception of a triune God, though the difference between Plotinus and Christian Trinitarianism is obvious.

The literary style is lucid despite the close reasoning.

In the Handbook on the Parables of Jesus called *And Jesus Said* (Church of Scotland Youth Committee; 4s. net) the Rev. William Barclay, B.D., once more puts his scholarship to the service of ordinary young folk with the skill acquired not only in academic but in years of strenuous pastoral work. Readers of this magazine will know well what to expect in the way of fresh, practical, pungent, richly illustrated and warmly devotional exposition.

The book is not meant to be provocative except of Christian living and thinking; and this, rather than reluctance to abandon good homiletic material, may explain Mr. Barclay's repeated decision not to decide between the traditional and the modern interpretation of certain parables. Nor does he obtrude any scheme of arrangement or grouping of the parables. But he has produced a book that will be of inestimable value alike to youth and to those whose business is to teach.

A re-issue by Messrs. James Clarke at 4s. 6d. net celebrates only two years late the jubilee of Professor P. Carnegie Simpson's excellent little book, *The Fact of Christ*. It remains excellent reading though an apologist of his type to-day

would use a terser style and would have more to say on the Church. The editor, who gives away the first date of publication in a footnote, is far from exact in calling Matthew Arnold's 'Literature and Dogma' and Mrs. Ward's 'Robert Elsmere' 'contemporary works' with *The Fact of Christ.*

In a book written for ministers, *The Man in the Manse,* the Rev. John Bishop, M.A. (Epworth Press; 9s. 6d. net) has compiled wise, witty, and helpful advice relating to every aspect of ministerial life and work, and from the point of view both of common sense and high idealism. Some clerics might despise it as too simple and obvious. A layman reading it would probably itch to give it to his minister.

Rabbi Leslie I. Edgar, M.A., in his Essex Hall Lecture—*Co-operation Between World Religions* (Lindsey Press; 2s. net)—shows the urgency of co-operation between world religions, but he holds that a world-faith, in the sense of either a syncretism or a victorious religion is neither possible nor desirable. He is concerned with the relationship between actually existing faiths and seeks to show that their claim to continue in existence, side by side, must be acknowledged. His main point is that useful mutual contribution depends upon our *not* envisaging the possibility of one faith achieving the full potentialities of the various world faiths. At the same time he pleads that each faith, if it is to benefit from other faiths, must maintain full self-respect and a 'virile intolerance' of its own, and it is a little difficult to see how this can be combined with a resolute shutting of the eyes to the possibility of an ultimate comprehensive victory. The argument would seem to be rather precariously poised upon metaphysical pluralism and religious relativity.

The Fruits of Controversy, by Dr. Edward Langton, F.R.Hist.S., F.R.A.S. (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net), is a popular but scholarly book in three parts. The first traces the story of the Pilgrim Fathers from the beginnings at Scrooby down to the formation of the confederacy called the United Colonies of New England in 1643. The second deals with the Reformation in Scotland and comes down through the Covenanting period to the Revolution Settlement of the Presbyterian Church. The author is a little too favourable to the Covenanters. Religious freedom was not among their ideals. It was rather by Divine overruling than by their seeking that religious freedom issued from their resistance to the Stuarts. In the third part Dr. Langton discusses the abiding values gained through these controversies and deprecates the abandonment of controversy in the interests of a false conception of Christian unity. He concludes that a federal union of churches is the only practical kind of union to-day.

The seventeenth century was the great age of English moral theology. Its revival in recent times has been chiefly under the auspices of the High Church School; but in those days Anglican and Separatist, High Churchman and Puritan were at one in seeking 'to educate the individual conscience in the way of holiness, and to educate the social conscience in the way of justice.' To this fascinating field of study we have a scholarly introduction, *English Casuistical Divinity During the Seventeenth Century,* by Mr. Thomas Wood (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net).

The author deals specially with Jeremy Taylor, but all the major figures come in for quotation—Puritans like Perkins, Ames, and Richard Baxter; prelates like Hall, Sanderson and John Sharp, Archbishop of York. These men held that there is no activity of human life which falls outside the range of Christian morals. Among other things, they sought 'to make men look at economics through the eye of faith.' They reacted strongly against anything that savoured of Jesuitism, and, while following the traditional teaching of such mediæval writers as Aquinas, they took an independent line on several points of economic practice and a truly Protestant line on the fundamental doctrine of repentance.

All this and much more Mr. Wood brings out clearly. His book is made more useful by having not only an index and a bibliography, but a full synopsis of the chapters. We would encourage him to go forward to the more comprehensive study mentioned in his introduction to this useful book.

Professor Karl Jasper's little but pregnant book on *Reason and Anti-Reason in Our Time* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net) is very timely. Over large areas Reason is in abeyance. Emotionalisms and a kind of superstition have submerged it. The author analyses two of the manifestations of anti-reason—Marxism and Psycho-analysis. In both he recognizes what merit there is, but both have become anti-reasonable. Reason means, fundamentally, love of truth, and in neither is desire for real truth admissible. The hero-worship of Marx or Hitler scorns quests for truth. Truth is whatever the 'wizard' says. The crowd is 'bewitched' and of course the idolatry he receives increases the self-assurance of the 'wizard.' The author remains hopeful that Reason will come into its own again, and that the fruitful study of Philosophy will survive in Universities.

The book is admirably translated by Mr. Stanley Godman.

Books on the Person of Christ

Creed's Essay in 'Mysterium Christi'

By the Reverend John Stewart Lawton, M.A., B.D., D.Phil., Padiham Vicarage, Burnley

Modern knowledge and ways of thinking have impinged upon traditional Christian beliefs at many points, but at none so vital as the doctrines concerning the historic Christ.

The full impact was felt in Germany long before anything but its distant rumblings were heard in Britain. When the nineteenth century dawned, Hegel and Schleiermacher were already at work, and investigations were being made by others into the history underlying the gospel narrative on rationalistic principles. From that time onwards there was continuous activity and development in the fields of the philosophy of religion, dogmatic theology and Biblical criticism. Theology in Britain meanwhile was not standing still. The Evangelical Revival had initiated a revolution in apologetics and the concept of revelation, which, through the added insight of thinkers such as Coleridge and Maurice, gradually created a theology vastly different from Evidentialism and the thought of the so-called Enlightenment. Through the Catholic Revival in the Anglican communion, Patristic and even post-Tridentine thought was added to the lively stream. It was not until the closing years of the century that the conclusions of Biblical criticism became firmly and widely established, and the peculiarly modern Christological problems became living issues in this country. The object of Creed's essay in *Mysterium Christi* is to draw attention to some of the highlights in the picture of British Christology since the full acceptance of Biblical criticism.

The proximate cause of the upheaval came when Gore suggested in *Lux Mundi* that Christ's references to Old Testament Scriptures by the names of their traditional authors did not foreclose the critical investigation of their authorship. There were loud protests. If the knowledge of the Incarnate was in any way humanly conditioned, not only was belief in His personal Deity imperilled, but the acceptance of His authority as a teacher and His sinlessness also stood in jeopardy. Yet, in an astonishingly short time, the great majority of British theologians—even of the high Anglicans—came to accept the view that, in matters of factual knowledge, Christ's mind was fully human. Thus a view of the Incarnation and of the manner of revelation, held since at least sub-Apostolic times, disappeared almost overnight. To Creed it suffices to note the fact of the change as a postulate for any acceptable Christology. 'The historical study of the Gospels,' he says, 'has compelled a general recognition that the historical Jesus of Nazareth was humanly conditioned in His knowledge and in His entire consciousness. However the divinity of Jesus Christ is asserted, it must do justice to this plain fact' (p. 132 f.).

Creed says not a word of the other controversial element in the gospel records, the miracles. Yet the discussion of the nature and the soteriological relevance of the miracles has played a very considerable part in the Christology of Britain during the present century. On the one hand, it has been argued that, if we are serious about the belief that revelation came through the truly human personality of Jesus, it is only consistent to jettison the miracles, which presuppose a different view of revelation. In any case, it is said, miracles fit awkwardly into the modern picture of the universe, and the evidence for the Biblical miracles is by no means satisfactory. On the other hand, it is a remarkable fact—when contrasted with the easy acceptance of Christ's limited consciousness—how strong a position the miracles have continued to hold in the minds of so many British theologians. In contrast to the old evidential view of miracles, Maurice, Westcott, and many others advanced the view that Christ's miracles—above all the Resurrection—were an integral and inseparable part of His personal revelation of God, and effectual instruments in the recovery of man from the power of evil. All this has been carried forward by many of the conservative theologians of our own century.

In the years between the appearance of *Lux Mundi* (1889) and the First World War, it was acutely felt that the admission of Christ's limited human knowledge demanded a restatement of Christology, in order to try to represent the manner in which the Eternal Word was made flesh under such conditions. A number of experimental Christologies were therefore produced in which one point is specially interesting. Despite the criticism heaped upon Chalcedonian Christology since T. H. Green's opening attack, several notable experiments moved along lines originally suggested in the ancient Antiochene Christology—that is to say, the union of God and man in Christ was

envisaged in psychological rather than in metaphysical terms. Sanday suggested that the point of union between God and man might be located in the subconscious mind of Jesus. Temple, in *Foundations*, thought that the moral union of the human will of Christ with the Divine Word was the true personal union which the hypostatic union had failed adequately to express.

But of more permanent significance was the elaboration at this time of the Kenotic theory, which took its rise in Germany in the middle of the nineteenth century to meet similar difficulties. It is here that Creed takes up the story. According to this theory 'the Divine Logos by His Incarnation divested Himself of His Divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence, so that in His incarnate life the Divine Person is revealed and solely revealed through a human consciousness' (p. 133). This conception of the incarnate life was a wide departure from that which had prevailed in the ancient Church—Loofs had shown that no real precedent for this type of thought could be adduced from Patristic writers. But, Creed adds, 'it is beyond question that it falls in with the thought and feeling of some great texts in the New Testament, and in the hands of teachers such as Dr. Gore and Professor Mackintosh it lends itself to a powerful interpretation of the doctrine of the Incarnation' (p. 133; cf. Ph 2^{5-8}, 2 Co 8^{9}).

Creed wisely selects Mackintosh to represent British Kenotic Christology; for in Mackintosh, as he points out, 'the emphasis falls less upon the limitations of the Lord's knowledge—a problem which is less felt as a problem now than it was a generation or two ago—but rather upon the ethical and religious value of the idea' (p. 133). Mackintosh states four positions which he thinks may be taken as implicit in the completely Christian view of Jesus (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, 469). '(1) Christ is now Divine, as being the object of faith and worship, with whom believing men have immediate, though not unmediated, fellowship. (2) In some personal sense His Divinity is eternal, not the fruit of time, since by definition Godhead cannot have come to be *ex nihilo*; His premundane being therefore is real, not ideal merely. (3) His life on earth was unequivocally human. Jesus was a man, a Jew of the first century. . . . The life Divine in Him found expression through human faculty, with a self-consciousness and activity mediated by His human *milieu*. (4) We cannot predicate of Him two consciousnesses or two wills; the New Testament indicates nothing of the kind, nor indeed is it congruous with an intelligible psychology. The unity of His personal life is axiomatic.' Taking these four points together, Mackintosh urged that we might infer that 'a real surrender of the glory and prerogatives of deity, "a moral act in the heavenly sphere," must have preceded the advent of God in Christ. We are faced by a Divine self-reduction which entailed obedience, temptation, and death. So that religion has a vast stake in the *kenosis* as a fact, whatever the difficulties as to its method may be' (p. 470).

Forsyth would equally well have served the purpose of exemplification, had it been possible so concisely to summarize his thought. His *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* appeared in 1907, and—though this was not so clearly seen when Creed wrote—it is one of the most important works on Christology that this country has produced in the present century. Forsyth set himself to swim hard against the flood-tide of liberal theology, not on behalf of any obscurantism, but on the grounds of the theology of the Bible itself—the doctrine of the unique personal Word to man, both revealing and saving.

Profound as were the problems created by the admission of Christ's human consciousness, they have by no means absorbed the whole attention of British theologians. Indeed, a considerable portion of Creed's essay is devoted to a description of some of the leading expositions of incarnational theology, which he contrasts with the German schools in which the Atonement is the controlling doctrine. 'In an age,' says Creed, 'which has learnt from Descartes to doubt, from Kant to distinguish the spheres of faith and knowledge, and from scholars to criticize the very fountains of "revealed" knowledge, it has been timely that we should be reminded that Christianity is not primarily speculative, and it has been just that theologians of the Evangelical and Reformed Churches should find their way behind the thin rationalism of the Illumination and the dreary epoch of Protestant scholasticism to the central idea of the Reformation. What is of primary importance in the doctrine of Christ's divinity is not speculative solution of the difficulties, but the saving apprehension of God in Christ by Faith' (p. 124 f.). In British theology to-day, however, 'there is no apparent *general* tendency to find a regenerative theological principle in the theology of the Reformation era.' 'It is in keeping with this condition of our theology that the approach to the doctrine of Christ's Person is by no means universally conditioned by emphasis upon the soteriological aspect of His coming' (p. 125). In Anglican theology, at any rate, it is possible to recognize the existence at least from the seventeenth century of a Third Force, over against the tendencies towards the more rigidly Catholic and Protestant traditions.

Dr. Inge has been both a bold champion and a most skilful exponent of the theology based on Platonic philosophy. Religion to him is life in

communion with the eternal world of spirit, which our spirits perceive by apprehending the absolute values of Beauty, Truth, and Goodness. But, like Augustine, he knows the limitations as well as the verity of the Platonic creed. That 'the Word became flesh' he could not learn from Plato, and it is the Incarnation which sets the keystone in the Platonic arch. The Divine Logos, through whom the worlds were made, and who sustains them in being, is not exhausted in His creation, but remains transcendent as well as immanent in it. Nothing but a personal Incarnation, and the self-sacrifice of the Incarnate, could either adequately reveal the love of God for man, or call forth the love of man for God. Dr. Inge speaks frequently of 'a personal incarnation,' but he does not deal directly with the problem as to how we are to think of the cosmic Logos in relation to the human Jesus Christ.

In other writers, too, Creed finds a pronounced tendency to interpret the Incarnation as climax and clue to a philosophy of the universe, and if this tendency, he says, often goes hand in hand with a deference to patristic theology, this is to be ascribed not merely to respect for tradition, but also to an innate affinity to that Platonic world view which lies behind much early patristic philosophy of the Incarnation. Thus Professor Hodgson, in his contribution to *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson), urges that in the Incarnation is to be found the key to the problem of creation. The real purpose of the Incarnation was to bring eternal life into the world of time. This is the dominant idea in this and in other essays in the same volume. The need of redemption from sin finds emphatic expression, but it remains a subordinate theme. Another work, *The Incarnate Lord*, by the Rev. Lionel Thornton, aims at showing the coherence of the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation with an 'organic' view of the universe, such as that expounded by Whitehead. The universe is seen to be a graduated hierarchy of organisms. At the level of spirit, the organic order is found to be related to an 'eternal order,' or to God, who is at once ground and goal of the whole. The Incarnation is the climax of the progressive incorporation of 'the eternal order' into the organic series, and it is maintained that the organic conception of the universe makes it easier for the mind to accept the essential positions of the Nicene and post-Nicene Christology. The Incarnation means that the absolute actuality, as it exists in the Person of the eternal Word, becomes the principle of unity in a human organism.

It is perhaps regrettable that Creed did not find it possible to begin this part of his discussion with the *Lux Mundi* men. For it was they who first sought to draw the categories of evolution and Divine immanence into the very heart of the traditional scheme of doctrine. The Incarnation, and even its miraculous accompaniments, were envisaged by these very constructive theologians as the crowning point of God's personal activity in the world process. In the hands of men so deeply rooted in traditional Christian doctrine, these newly understood categories could be powerful instruments in the elaboration of a theology of Divine revelation and re-creation that was both genuinely ancient and modern. But at the same time, the leaven of Hegel was working its way through many other writers towards types of Christian thinking far removed from doctrines of the supernatural rescue of man from sin.

Hence, Creed is circumspectly critical of the tendency in Britain to work mainly with the idea of Incarnation rather than Atonement. In the writings of theologians such as H. R. Mackintosh, P. T. Forsyth, A. E. Garvie, and J. K. Mozley, however, a certain reaction to this tendency may be felt. 'These writers,' Creed observes, 'betray a manifest note of uneasiness in the present situation, and a fear that the peculiarly Christian emphasis upon the Cross may be failing to find proper expression. Unless the doctrine of the Incarnation is nailed to the Cross it tends to lose definition and to evaporate into a cosmic principle' (p. 129).

Then, again, Creed points out, in the Church of England especially, the theology of the Fathers and the Councils was and is widely regarded as the classical and normative theology of the Christian Church. For example, the essay on the Incarnation in the volume, *Essays Catholic and Critical*, takes the form of an interpretation and a defence by Dr. Mozley of the Chalcedonian doctrine. Not all Anglicans pay the same deference to conciliar definitions, yet even where conclusions are widely different, patristic theology is generally the starting-point. Some of the most valuable English contributions to the literature of Christology have taken the form of historical studies of doctrine in the Early Church—such as C. E. Raven's *Apollinarianism*.

Creed shows himself to be amongst those many divines who can find little of present-day service in the patristic formularies. 'The parallelism of the two natures,' he says, 'and the two wills, united by their common relation to the one divine hypostasis, is a theory hard to reconcile with an intelligible conception of personality. And the theory finds no warrant in the Gospels. . . . Nor can we now work easily with the idea that Christ had a human nature, complete yet "impersonal." Whatever else Jesus of Nazareth was, He was certainly a man' (p. 132). He appears to concur with Bethune-Baker's conclusion, that, if we are

to work with the orthodox theory of the Incarnation, we can only do so by making use of the conception of kenosis to the fullest extent (J. F. Bethune-Baker, *The Way of Modernism*, 98).

Dr. Bethune-Baker himself represented a quite different approach to the doctrine of the Incarnation, which Creed describes. The traditional doctrine of the Incarnation had been framed against the Biblical picture of the Creation and the Fall. The Creation was the presupposition of the Incarnation, and the Fall set the problem which Calvary and the Resurrection had resolved. To-day, the argument runs, the time-honoured background of the Catholic Faith is no longer the unspoken presupposition dominating the imagination of plain men and women. Where does Christian doctrine find contact with a world view dominated by the idea of evolution? Christology, the doctrine of the Redeemer's person, had a perfectly intelligible place in the ancient world view; what is its place and purpose now? Bethune-Baker's fundamental answer is that the whole process of the universe in evolution is incarnation. The whole universe is not merely the scene of God's operations, but a manifestation of Him, in all the stages of its evolution (*The Way of Modernism*, 85). In this view, the familiar antithesis of natural and supernatural disappeared—the natural was the way in which the Divine purpose was being realized. Bethune-Baker's primary and fundamental condition of the doctrine of the Incarnation was the postulate that the being of God and the being of man were indissolubly interrelated. Because the highest values were actualized in Jesus, we must call him God (*Mysterium Christi*, 139).

The Christology of Bethune-Baker and the group of English Modernists around him has certain intrinsic difficulties. It is compounded of elements drawn both from Ritschlianism and Catholic Modernism. It finds its centre in the Ritschlian theology of value-judgment of the religious experience of the man Jesus. For its validity, therefore, it depends upon the 'Liberal' reading of the life of Jesus—in which He is portrayed as the Teacher of the perfect ethic and the subject of certain unique spiritual experiences. There is also some emphasis upon the Modernist idea of the symbolic value of the Christian dogmas in themselves—such as that of the pre-existence of the Christ—as being embodiments of 'eternal truths.' But there is a still wider problem.

The Christology of the English Modernists was the climax of the attempt to subsume the whole of religion under an exclusively immanental theology. Sanday went so far as to prophesy that the exclusion of the 'miraculous' from the Incarnation could lead to a complete unification of religious and secular thought in the modern world. Perhaps, but at what a price are the Biblical categories excluded! Creed himself poses the query in his own way:

'The Christian Church is deeply indebted to those theologians who persistently press upon it a due recognition of the momentous change which has been brought about in the background of our thought concerning God and the world by the advent and victory of the idea of evolution in the realms both of nature and of history. . . . It is, however, possible to combine a full and hearty acknowledgment of this debt with a certain hesitation as to whether an evolutionary Monism is the inevitable philosophy of the future, and whether such a philosophy affords the most appropriate categories in which to state the Christian faith' (p. 139).

The older schools of British conservative theology held their ground long enough for their essential positions to be reinforced from many new directions. Before the First World War, Forsyth was vehemently contending that the theology of the Bible was *sui generis*—something whose uniqueness was destroyed, not enhanced, by many modern 'restatements'; and our own generation has seen the rise of a whole new school of Biblical theology. In the field of the philosophy of religion, Oman, Taylor, Farmer, and a score of other eminent thinkers, have shown that immanentalism and monism do not do justice even to the facts about the human personality, let alone to the Christian assertions.

The attempt was made in the second century to work the gospel into a scheme of human philosophy. The same attempt has been made in modern times by many minds, of whom the greatest was Hegel. But the claim of the Bible is not that here is one more thing that man has discovered, but that the living, personal God has spoken—in history, in the prophets, and in His Son. The significant fact in Christendom to-day is that, despite the recognition of the true and complete humanity of Christ, great numbers of Christians, wide awake spiritually and intellectually, go on making the same affirmations about His person and work as do the New Testament and the ancient formularies. The first disciples ate and drank with the Lord—they had no illusions about His true humanity. Yet the gospel records contain staggering claims for Christ's Person—that He set Himself above the Law of Moses, and forgave sins; that He declared His death to be a 'ransom for many,' and claimed that no man knoweth 'the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.' Is it really surprising that we too should be able to know Him as true man and yet also as true God?

Believing and Everlasting Life—A Johannine Inquiry

By the Reverend William Turner, B.D., Gargunnock

The Fourth Gospel's emphasis on 'life,' its character and its attainment is so well known and so universally accepted that the exact nature of this emphasis is seldom demonstrated by the expositors. That this emphasis deserves and repays more detailed investigation, it is the purpose of this article to show.

I

In the Authorised Version, the one Greek phrase, ζωὴ αἰώνιος (which occurs seventeen times), is translated, for no apparent reason, nine times as 'eternal life' and eight times as 'everlasting life.' This at once leads us to ask, what is the exact meaning of αἰώνιος? Αἰών is the same as the Latin *aevum*, and may mean 'a lifetime' or 'a long space of time' or 'an age.' Plato in the *Timaeus* gives the word αἰώνιος a specialized meaning, and uses it in the sense of 'eternity' as opposed to 'time' (χρόνος). The adjective αἰώνιος is unclassical, the classical word being ἀίδιος; but, where it occurs, it means 'lasting for an age' or, more usually, 'perpetual' or 'everlasting.' This is its meaning in the Septuagint version of the Book of Daniel. We may also note that this was its meaning when, in the later Roman Empire, it was one of the favourite epithets of the Emperors.

But what is the exact sense in which this adjective is used by the Fourth Evangelist? Some have assumed that the meaning is that given by Plato to αἰών, namely, that αἰώνιος is 'eternal' in the sense of 'belonging to eternity.' On this view, ζωὴ αἰώνιος would be 'eternal life' in the sense of 'life in eternity.' However, if one considers the actual usage of the Evangelist, there can be no doubt that he uses αἰώνιος in the sense of 'perpetual,' 'never-ending,' 'everlasting.'

With one exception, αἰών occurs in the Fourth Gospel only in the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, which, I maintain, means 'for ever.' Behind this unclassical phrase, there probably lies the Semitic עַד־עוֹלָם or לְעוֹלָם; or it may just be an instance of the Hellenistic drift towards the preposition εἰς, which has resulted in the ubiquitous στό of modern Greek. The phrase occurs in such contexts as these—'shall live for ever,' 'shall never thirst,' 'shall never taste of death.' If any one tried to maintain that 'in eternity' should be substituted for 'ever' in these examples, the impossibility of such a translation is shown by the fact that in 4^{14} and 6^{35} we have the same idea expressed, namely, 'shall never thirst.' In the first instance, 'never' is οὐ μὴ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; in the second, 'never' is οὐ μὴ . . . . πώποτε. If final proof is required, we have it in 13^{8}, where Peter asserts to our Lord, 'Thou shalt never (οὐ μὴ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) wash my feet.' This just cannot mean 'Thou shalt never wash my feet in eternity [*or* the new age].'

The exception mentioned above occurs in 9^{32}, 'Since the world began (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος) was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind.' The meaning here is surely this: '*Never in the past* was it heard,' etc.

If this evidence for the meaning attached to αἰών is accepted, it follows that the corresponding adjective (αἰώνιος) must have the same meaning, namely, 'for ever' or 'everlasting.' It is precisely because the adjective means 'everlasting' when conjoined with 'life' that 'everlasting life' is so often referred to as a possible *immediate* possession ($3^{16.\ 36}$ 5^{24} 11^{26}). It is possible to have *everlasting* life here and now; but it is impossible to have here and now life *in eternity*.

It is of some interest to note in passing that the root of αἰών is related to the Sanskrit *āyu*, of which the predominating idea is 'life' or 'long life.' Thus, philologically, ζωὴ αἰώνιος is tautological; it is 'living life,' 'the life that is life.' It would almost appear that the Evangelist was aware of this root meaning of αἰώνιος, for he never uses it to qualify any other noun except ζωή, and he uses it thus seventeen times.

Even where 'life' is used without the adjective, it is always quite clear that it is the life that is everlasting that is meant. At 3^{36} $5^{24.\ 26.\ 29.\ 40}$ $6^{51.\ 53}$ 11^{25} 'life' occurs so near to 'everlasting life' or a similar expression that it is obviously used as an equivalent. In the other cases, the context shows that this is still the sense (1^{4} $6^{33.\ 35.\ 48}$ 8^{12} 10^{10} 14^{6} 20^{31}). This conclusion is further supported by the use of the corresponding verb at $4^{10.\ 11}$ 5^{25} 6^{51} $6^{57.\ 58}$ 14^{19} 20^{31}.

It is well known that, where English has only 'life,' Greek has ζωή, βίος, and ψυχή. In all the references quoted in the preceding paragraph, the Greek is, of course, ζωή. βίος is found once in St. Mark, five times in St. Luke, but never in the Fourth Gospel. The Evangelist is not interested in life in the biological sense.

ψυχή is used ten times. It is used of the Good Shepherd laying down His *life* for the sheep

(10[11. 15. 17]), of Peter laying down his *life* for his Lord's sake (13[37. 38]), and of a man laying down his *life* for his friends (15[13]). It is used of loving *life* and hating *life* (12[25]). In 12[27] our Lord says (A.V.), 'Now is my soul [ψυχή] troubled'; and at 10[24] there occurs the idiomatic phrase, ψυχὴν αἴρειν, meaning 'to excite the spirits' or 'to keep in suspense' (A.V. 'to doubt'). In every single case, ψυχή is used with care (and correctly) to signify the life that is limited to this world and, especially, the sensory life.

There may be some who would be prepared to dispute that the Evangelist uses ψυχή with care on the grounds of 10[17], where our Lord not only says that He will lay down His life (τὴν ψυχήν μου), but that He does so in order that He may take it again (ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν). This, of course, may refer to our Lord's resurrection, when He does appear to have resumed in some manner a sensory life. A parallel case to 10[17] is 12[25], where it is stated 'he that hateth his life (τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ) in this world shall keep it unto life eternal (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν).' There is really no confusion here, and no carelessness as to the use of terms. The Evangelist is suggesting that there is a ψυχὴ ζωῆς as well as a ψυχὴ βίου; that is, that as bodily life has a sensory aspect, so also has everlasting life (even after death) a similar or corresponding mode of being.

II

How is this most precious gift of everlasting life to be appropriated?

Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor, in his Commentary on St. John, points out that 'it has been held that, in some passages, John appears to regard this "life" as an almost "semi-physical" bestowment, particularly in the Eucharistic discourse in the sixth chapter.' The principal text here is 6[54]: 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath "eternal" life' (A.V.). This seems definite evidence in support of the view that everlasting life is to be appropriated physically or, at least, sacramentally. But, surely, we must not ignore our Lord's explanation to the disciples, who had found this discourse 'a hard saying.' In 6[63], He is reported to have said, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken [reading λελάληκα] unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.' This whole passage deserves more detailed consideration than can be given to it here; but our Lord's own explanation, just quoted, is sufficient to make us hesitate (to say the least), to admit that everlasting life is to be gained, solely or even principally, by sacramental means.

With the exception of the references to 'the bread of life' in ch. 6, the Evangelist clearly teaches that the gift of everlasting life is bestowed upon those who believe *into* the Lord. Even if we omit 6[47] (where the reading is doubtful), there are four places (3[15] 3[16] 3[36] 6[40]) where the Evangelist quotes our Lord as saying (or asserts on his own responsibility) that believing *into* Him brings (here and now) everlasting life. This may not appear very conclusive evidence; but it should be noted that the last case quoted (6[40]) occurs right in the middle of the so-called 'Eucharistic' discourse; that, at 11[25. 26], we have our Lord saying to Martha that to believe *into* Him gives victory over death; and, finally, that all the other references to 'life' or 'everlasting life' fit quite naturally into this conception of the condition of attaining it.

The phrase 'believing into' is, of course, a literal rendering of the Greek πιστεύειν εἰς. Again we have to note an unclassical expression. It may possibly be another instance of the post-classical trend whereby the dative weakens and gives place to εἰς with the accusative. More likely, it is a Semitism. In Hebrew, 'believe' is rendered by הֶאֱמִין followed by בְּ or לְ. לְ would be rendered most naturally by the Greek dative. בְּ, which some Hebraists declare to denote not simple 'belief' but rather personal 'trust,' would more easily become εἰς.

Students of the New Testament are greatly indebted to all who have related the vocabulary and grammar of the New Testament to the Κοινή, to Hellenistic Greek, to the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, to Hebrew, to Aramaic. But there is a danger that in the excitement of the linguistic chase and in the joy of successfully tracking down our quarry, we may forget our ultimate purpose, which is *accurate exegesis*. The really important question regarding every word and phrase is not 'Where did it come from?' but 'What does the writer mean by it?'

In the case under discussion, there can be no doubt that the Evangelist uses the phrase with great care, and with the special meaning of absolute personal trust. He may very probably have written the phrase under Semitic influence; but could any one in the first or second century have written εἰς with the accusative without being conscious of the feeling of what the grammarians call 'motion towards'? The sense must be that the believer throws himself upon his Lord in loving, self-abandoning faith and trust. That, to the Evangelist, believing is a real *action*, is further proved by his complete avoidance of the *noun* (πίστις).

The extreme care with which the phrase (πιστεύειν εἰς) is used is readily realized when we note that it is used thirty-seven times in all; and that,

in every case except two, it is used of believing into Christ. The two exceptions are 14^{1} 'believe *into* God, believe also *into* me,' and 12^{44} 'He who believes *into* me believes not *into* me but into Him who sent me.' In these two instances of the phrase being used with reference to belief in *God*, the usage is due to the attraction of the parallel (preceding or following) phrase referring to belief into *Christ*.

A nice example of the Evangelist's care in his use of the expression is provided at $14^{11.\ 12}$: 'Believe me [dative] that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me [dative] for the very works' sake. Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth on me [εἰς with accusative] the works that I do shall he do also; . . .'

If we place the above along with 8^{31} 'Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him [dative] . . .', we see that the dative indicates a weaker type of belief. Believing *in* Christ is antecedent to believing *into* Christ. This meaning of the dative is supported by the Evangelist's use of the dative whenever believing is the subject of controversy or discussion between our Lord and His opponents (4^{21} 6^{30} 5^{38} $5^{46.\ 47}$ 8^{31} $8^{45.\ 46}$ $10^{37.\ 38}$ 14^{11}). Other uses of the dative are where it is a matter of believing in *words* or *writings* (2^{22} 4^{50} 10^{38} 12^{38}); of believing in *God* (5^{24}) or *Moses* (5^{46}). The only remaining occurrences of the verb governing the dative or the accusative are 2^{24} (A.V.: 'Jesus did not commit himself [acc.] to them [dat.]') and 11^{26} ('Believest thou this [acc.]').

In every other case (actually thirty-eight instances), the verb is used absolutely or followed by a 'that' clause.

Following upon this exhaustive study of the Evangelist's use of the verb, we may conclude with assurance that, in his view of our Lord's teaching, we have to bring ourselves to a great act of self-surrender if we would obtain everlasting life. It is no mere mental assent that is thought of. It is an outgoing of the self, which casts itself upon the Lord Jesus Christ.

III

Our purpose in the foregoing paragraphs has not only been to establish the exact meanings of 'life,' 'everlasting life' and 'believing *into*' Christ. Believing into Christ has been established as the essential condition of attaining here and now life that will last for ever. Finally, in pursuing our inquiry, we have demonstrated the extreme care with which the Evangelist uses the terms which we had to consider.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

E.O.D.

By the Reverend A. Beaghen, Malmesbury Abbey, Wilts

'Enter ye in at the strait gate.'—Mt 7^{13}.

I was just going to enter a shop in Switzerland when, to my surprise, the two rather swell swing doors opened before me and I went in. I saw a boy sitting just inside and thought he had opened it and I said 'Thank you.' He looked a bit puzzled and got off his seat on the rail and went out. Then I saw some one go out and the door opened again. I was quite interested by then and asked what made the door open. It was a patent door and if you looked at it carefully it had two rails projecting about three feet on either side. Well, at the end of each rail there was an invisible ray that crossed from one side of the rail to the other and when you passed through that invisible ray, or 'beam,' the door opened. 'Open Sesame' outdated! I felt like playing with it as we used to want to play on the escalator on the Underground when it was first introduced. If all doors were like that we should never have to open and close them and no one would shout 'Shut the door!' when we forgot. I found myself thinking of Jesus saying 'I am the door.' The very first thing to do about doors is to go through them, and there is no door that exists that is any use otherwise. Jesus says, 'Enter.' Dr. Barnardo's Homes are the E.O.D. (Ever Open Door) for children in need. The door of the Kingdom of Jesus is ever open to all who will enter. Have YOU entered yet?

Some people spend a long time *looking at it*. It's too good to be true. When that new sort of shop door was first introduced many people refused to go through. They stood outside and watched other people going through but they took a long time to make up their minds that it was really true and that it worked and that it wouldn't fail to open, *if they fulfilled the conditions*. 'Enter,' go in if you want to buy something. And Jesus said the very same thing—'Come,' 'Enter.' You must accept *My* word for it. The door opens and you enter My Home-Kingdom for ever. You become Mine. You are pardoned and blessed and given the rights of all the citizens of My Kingdom.

It is not much use gazing in wonder at Him if you don't *come* to Him.

I remember seeing a cartoon once which showed two men passing the Public Baths. One was a well-dressed gentleman with fine clothes and everything he thought he needed to make him happy, and the other was a dirty, black, sweep carrying his brushes on his shoulder. As they both looked towards the baths the one said, 'Too clean,' the other said, 'Too dirty,' and both passed by. Jesus never said anything like that about anybody. He said, 'Enter' by the *ever open door*. And I say again, *Have you done it?* I could tell you all the lovely things that happen when you do, because I did it many years ago and I have never regretted it.

Knights of the Thistle and St. Andrew

(St. Andrew's Day)

By the Reverend G. W. Sterry, Bristol

Recently I had a great thrill. I watched at a television set and saw the procession of Knights of the Thistle, led by the Queen, coming from St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh. The Queen and her Knights were dressed in the beautiful robes of the Order, and were wearing the splendid gold and enamel Collar and Badge and Star.

I was especially interested in that Badge. It is very lovely, and very precious, made as it is of gold and rich enamels. It has two sides, that is, it is not plain on one side as many of your badges are, but has a design on both sides. On one side, worked in gold and enamel, is an image of St. Andrew. He stands there quietly holding his cross before him. He is the patron saint of the Knights of the Thistle; sometimes they are known as the Noble Order of St. Andrew. On the other side, done also in gold and in green enamel is—a Thistle! And round it there is a Latin motto—'*Nemo me impune lacessit*,' which can be translated into English as 'No one can challenge me without getting hurt.' 'No one can touch me and get away with it!' It is about that badge I want to speak to you.

It has two sides—one of St. Andrew, a good, helpful, kindly man, patiently, bravely witnessing for Jesus; the other of a Thistle, a very prickly, uncomfortable thing, with its prickly motto: 'Nobody can touch me without getting hurt.' What a queer mixture! And yet you know, that badge is just like every boy and every girl that ever I knew or heard of. There can never be more than sixteen Knights of the Thistle in the Scottish Order, but every boy and girl is born into the world as a knight of that other order of the thistle. For isn't it one of the things we most often say: 'If you hit me I'll hit you!' 'You can't touch me and get away with it!' An uncomfortable, prickly attitude. And yet every boy and girl has another side, an Andrew side, a pleasant, helpful, kindly side. There may be only sixteen Knights in the Order of the Thistle but every boy and girl is in the Noble Order of St. Andrew.

The question is, if we have two sides like that badge, which side are you going to have uppermost—are you a Thistle or a St. Andrew?

1. St. Andrew was unselfish (Jn 1^{41-42}). When he found Jesus he wanted to share Him with Peter. He 'first findeth his own brother Peter' 'and he brought him to Jesus.' We must be ready to share our good things.

2. Andrew was a friendly person (Jn 12^{20-22}). Philip quite naturally turned to him for help and advice when he was approached by certain Greeks who wanted to see Jesus. Andrew was helpful and friendly, and so must we be.

3. Andrew never put himself forward. When he had done his work he stepped aside. He was the first called of Christ's disciples.

> The first to follow Christ the Lord
> Such name thou hast.

But he was content to be known as 'Simon Peter's brother.'

Knights of the Thistle and St. Andrew! Which side will *you* wear uppermost?

The Christian Year

Sunday Next before Advent

The Inward Conviction of Faith

By the Reverend H. V. Martin, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Cores End, Bucks

'Faith is . . . the evidence of things not seen.'—He 11^{1}.

The eleventh chapter of Hebrews is the great chapter on faith just as the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians is the great chapter on love. There are innumerable definitions of faith, each one complementary to the others. The jewel of faith has so many facets that each reflects its own light, as we view it from various angles.

The writer of this Epistle to the Hebrews begins with a definition which he thought might help his readers to grasp one aspect of this cardinal virtue. Faith, he says, is the evidence of things not seen—or, as we may expand it, faith is the inward conviction and apprehension of unseen realities. This is his theme in this chapter; and through the lives of the patriarchs and heroes of Israel, he

illustrates the activity of faith in human life surrendered to God.

People may be divided into two classes—one-world people and two-world people. The first group believe only in this visible world ; the second group believe in an invisible world as well, the world of God and spiritual realities. The distinguishing mark between the two classes is faith.

How, then, does this inward conviction of the reality of the unseen world of God come to us ? I am speaking of faith as a sure conviction, not as a vague pious hope or possibility. How can we be sure of this unseen world—as sure as we are of this visible world ? It can only come by facing up to certain problems in the right way.

Firstly, let us ask : How did this visible world come into existence ? To my mind, there is only one answer—that it was created by a Supreme Being whom we call God. For what is the alternative ? Did the world just happen—by chance ? Even though the world of Nature is controlled by certain laws, how did they arise—by chance ? If the laws of Nature exist by chance, then we must logically allow that to-morrow chance may completely alter them. No. To deny the creation of this world by a Supreme Being is to lead to mental chaos, and to rob life and thought of all meaning.

Please do not confuse the fact of creation with the method or process. If we want to know how or when the world was created, we must go to the philosopher and the scientist. Religion deals with the fact and its meaning, science and philosophy deal with the means. We may not be able fully to understand how and when the world was created by God, but the fact is sure. After all, we are quite sure of many things which we cannot fully understand. Think of homing pigeons flying hundreds of miles over unknown country straight to their homes. Think of other migratory birds flying up to two thousand miles over oceans without sight of land for the first time, and navigating surely and safely to some small group of islands. The fact is sure, though the explanation may still be beyond us.

Having carried you with me, I hope, thus far, let us go on to ask a further question. Why did God create this world ? Here, again, there is only one answer. God created the world for mankind. Man is the crown of creation—the highest form of life in this world. This is to me so obvious a fact that it hardly needs further stress unless some one is going to say that God made this world for butterflies in a field or for pigs in a pen.

Here, again, do not get confused with the how and the when. Stick to the fact. The means or method by which the human race has come to its present position is a matter mainly for science. Religion deals with the fact and its meaning—that man is the goal of God's purpose in creating this world.

If we are now convinced of this, let us be also sure that God did not create this whole world for man, and then forget all about him. So now we ask : Why did God create this world for man ? What is God's concern for man now ? Before we can answer this plainly, we have to consider two more indisputable facts. The first is the fact of evil. Will we deny that something has gone wrong somewhere in this world ? We do not need to think long nor to look far to realize that no man's needs in this world are fully satisfied. Even for the most fortunate, this world is no paradise. Misery and calamity, sorrow and misfortune, are all around us. Nor need we over-exercise our intelligence in order to discover that evil is not just in circumstances, but, somehow or other, it is connected with man himself. Evil in the personal individual sense is sin, and sin is an indisputable fact. Again, do not get confused by worrying about the origin of evil. Stick for the moment to the fact—that sin exists even in the best of us, and is the cause of evil.

The next fact arises from the first. God is concerned for man now because of man's desperate need, born of his sin. The fact of man's inner need cannot be gainsaid, whether we individually are aware of it or not. I am speaking now of ' soul ' need, the root need of every individual for some Divine help. Sadhu Sundar Singh, the great Indian Christian preacher, used to illustrate the nature of sin by comparing man to two sheets of thin white paper with a black carbon between. If you press hard with your finger on the top sheet, it does not show, but it does show on the sheet underneath. When we sin, even in the slightest way, we may say it is nothing and forget about it, but the black impression is there, in the soul. It leaves a stain which if not cleansed will eventually bring the soul to ruin.

The ultimate inward need of man is such that no earthly aid is sufficient. There are times when we feel it, but so often we deny it even to ourselves. We try every human expedient. Like the silversmiths of Ephesus, we are more concerned for our silver than for our souls. But there is no human solution for the problem of our sin. Such expedients are like throwing an iron lifebelt to a drowning man, it will only sink him the quicker if he trusts in it.

So we come to the final question. Will God help us ? Here argument comes to an end. Argument and thought can help us so far—to the edge of the gap. But all argument is futile unless we finally make the leap. What I want you to accept and to believe is that God can and will help you through Jesus Christ. Inward conviction will not come

until we make the jump—to trust God's promise in Christ, and thus make it come true for us. In the light of positive argument, in response to the logic of life, and in the face of our desperate need, we must gather together all the resources of the soul, and say, 'I will.'

The story is told that at the first meeting called to form the Young Men's Christian Association it was suggested that the name should be 'The Young Men's Religious Association.' But George Williams took his pen and crossed out the word 'Religious' and wrote 'Christian.' How right he was. A mere vague religious piety, an occasional prayer, or attending a few religious ceremonies—will that solve our deep need? Religion has no reality, and belief has no conviction, until, by the leap of commitment to Christ, God takes possession of us. Without the surrender of ourselves, the unseen world remains only a pious possibility. Without Christ, God is for us only 'an oblong blur.' Jesus Christ brings God into clear focus for us. But you must make the jump—the decision we call faith. May God Himself help you to say in your heart, 'I will.'

First Sunday in Advent

The Judgment of God

By the Reverend Professor Norman H. Snaith, D.D., Leeds

'For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him.'—Jn 3^{17} (R.V.).

The double strand of salvation and judgment is to be found throughout the Bible. In particular, it is associated with Advent, as is evident in the Anglican Collect for the First Sunday in Advent, the Collect which is repeated throughout Advent with the other Collects until Christmas Eve. The first time He came, it was in great humility; when He comes again, it will be in glorious majesty. His first Advent was as Saviour: 'thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.' His second Advent will be as Judge: 'We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge.'

The double strand is to be seen plainly, for instance, in Is 63^{7-14}. The prophet makes mention of the loving-kindnesses of the Lord, of His great goodness and of the multitudes of His mercies to the house of Israel. 'In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them.' 'But they rebelled . . . therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and himself fought against them.' The deciding factor was the response of the people: their rebellion brought about the change. The same emphasis is to be seen in the two readings appointed for this Sunday. The Old Testament reading is Is 1^{1-20}, which speaks of condemnation and judgment, and ends by offering pardon and cleansing, with the final alternative: 'if ye be willing and obedient. . . . But if ye refuse and rebel. . . .' Once more the deciding factor is the response of the people, their attitude to God. Again, in the New Testament reading for to-day (Jn 3^{1-21}), the deciding factor is whether or not men believe on Christ. 'He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the only begotten Son of God.' By 'judged' the Gospel writer means 'condemned.' The alternatives are condemnation and salvation; parallel to them are justice and grace. The judgment takes place when Christ comes, and our lot depends upon our response to Christ. It is either justice and condemnation or grace and salvation. The choice is with us, and we can choose whether we offer works or faith.

The Jews of old used to speak of two worlds, two ages, two spheres of thought and life. One was the kingdom of this world; the other was the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven impinged upon the kingdom of this world with the Advent of Messiah. The two worlds are quite different, and are run on different principles. The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is the best illustration of this. It is a story where all are paid alike, because the test is not how much work the labourer has done, nor at what time of the day did he come, but did he come, even though at the eleventh hour? The usual criticism of the Parable is that the world cannot be run that way, to which the answer is 'Nobody ever said it could.' This Parable is about the kingdom of heaven, not about the kingdom of this world. This world is run on the system of payment for work done, on justice. The other world, the kingdom of heaven, is not run on payment for work done, and it is not run on justice. It is quite another kind of world.

This present world, this earth that we see and touch, is a world of strict inexorable justice. Here, what men sow, they also reap. This is true of mankind, but not of individuals. The reason for this is very simple: it is that in this world there is no such thing as an individual, not in this isolated, individualistic sort of way. We are set in families, in parishes, townships, nations. We live in a world where it is becoming more and more true that everybody is sitting on everybody else's doorstep, unless it be on the threshold of everybody else's flat! We are, of course, each one of us obviously ourselves and nobody else, but at the same time we are never ourselves and nobody else to the extent that what we do has an effect

on ourselves and on nobody else. We are all knit together, willy-nilly, in a commonwealth of cause and effect. We all benefit from the good deeds which the good individuals do; we all suffer from the trouble which the wicked individuals cause by their wickedness. God has made this world so that right action inevitably brings happiness, and wrong action inevitably brings sorrow. He has made this world so that life goes hand in hand with righteousness, and death goes hand in hand with sin. This is the judgment of this world. The old Deuteronomist writers were right: the choice is righteousness and life, wickedness and death. They were right so long as they thought in terms of the people as a whole. It was when the principle of justice was applied to individuals that the system broke down, and there is no way out. In spite of Ezk 18, we *do* suffer for each other's sins, and must always do so in this mortal world. The tragedy of human life and death is that the innocent and guilty suffer alike, street accident, napalm bomb, railway crash—unless perchance it is nearer the truth to say that the innocent suffer more than the guilty! This world is a world of justice in the mass, injustice in the individual, but never, never a world of salvation.

But there is another world, the world where a man may meet with Christ. This, so to speak, is a vertical world and not a horizontal one. It is the world where Christ comes directly down, and comes down to save. Further, it is a world, in the first stage, of individuals, for in this world, this vertical world in which Christ comes directly down, each person is an individual to the extent that at the moment of confrontation with Christ, there is nobody else at all save only that one individual and Christ. There is no justice in this world. The conditions of entrance are not that a man should be good enough to enter in, not that he should have attained any standard of excellence. The dying thief got in, and the Pharisee was shut out. The conditions for entrance are that a man should come in Faith, fully surrendering and fully relying upon God. The pass-word into this world is not Justice, but Faith; and he passes in to the truest fellowship of all.

For my part, I pray that when I leave this work-a-day world, this confusion of justice and injustice, and when I stand before the judgment throne of God, when for the critical time I come face to face with Christ, I pray that He will say very little about justice, and a very great deal indeed about mercy and forgiveness. Which way He will speak will depend upon me. If I believe on the name of the only begotten Son of God, if I rely upon Him wholly in faith, then He will speak in terms of Salvation, of Grace, and Life, and He will bid me enter into the joy of my Lord. But if then, even after having preached to others, if then I have turned away from Christ, or if (which God forbid) I should be so full of my own works that there is no room for Christ, He will speak in terms of Judgment, of Justice, and Condemnation, and He will bid me go away into the outer darkness. Even so, come, Lord Jesus, and may I so live that I shall be glad to meet Him.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT—BIBLE SUNDAY

Why Read the Bible?

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL, D.D., UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

'These are they which bear witness of me.'—Jn 5^{39} (R.V.).

Why read the Bible? This is the sort of question our forefathers would not have asked. In the old days it was the book which practically everybody knew. Nowadays it is fast becoming the book that nobody knows. From time to time our great men tell us what we are missing by our neglect of it. Bernard Shaw said: 'The Bible is much more alive than this morning's paper.' Lord Montgomery says: 'I read my Bible every day, and I recommend you to do the same.' But we don't really believe them; we don't see the point of Bible reading. Why?

To begin with, many of us suppose that the Bible is quite out of date. After all, isn't it about two thousand years old? What light can it possibly cast on our modern problems, or the way we live in this queer, mad, troubled twentieth century? Another reason, no doubt, is that we find the Bible hard to understand. We just don't know what a great deal of it is driving at. And yet, though people do not read the Bible as they once did, they still have a great deal of reverence for it; and some have a vague feeling that, if we could get back to the words and wisdom of the Bible, we might begin to see our way out of the mess we are in. My own conviction is that there are a great many people who, if they could be shown reason why they should read the Bible, and given some sensible guidance about doing it, would be persuaded to take it down from their dusty shelves and have another look at what it has to say.

So let us see if we can find a convincing answer to the opening question.

1. Some years ago there appeared a volume called *The Bible Designed to be Read as Literature.* Is there a clue here? Well, beyond any doubt the Bible as it comes to us in the glorious English

of the Authorized Version is superb literature. History, poetry, prophecy, drama—there is God's plenty of it between the covers of the Bible. Read the lament of David for Saul and Jonathan, or the fortieth chapter of Isaiah, or the fifteenth chapter of St. Luke with its great short story of the father and his two boys, or the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians with its glorious hymn in praise of charity, and tell me where in all literature you will find anything to surpass them. No wonder our great writers have lavished their praises on the Bible as literature. And yet though that is one reason why, if you want to call yourself an educated man, you cannot afford to be ignorant of the Bible, it is not the reason why we Christians think it the most wonderful book in the world.

2. What then? People often call the Bible 'the good book.' A book about goodness? Is it as a sort of text-book on the good life that we ought to read it? Well, every serious-minded man or woman—I don't mean intellectual highbrows but everybody who is not satisfied with the sensations of the daily paper or filling up the weekly football coupon—wants to know how best he may live out his three score years and ten upon this planet. Can it be, then, because we have in the Bible the supreme text-book on morals that we ought to read it?

Once again the answer must be No, though now we are getting nearer the truth.

Of course there is moral light and leading in the Bible. The Ten Commandments, for example. They are pretty old, but they are very far from being out of date in these days when stealing is on the increase, murder is not uncommon, and adultery apparently has ceased to be a deadly sin. Moreover, the Bible contains the Sermon on the Mount. If it is moral light and leading that we are after, where will we find anything to compare with it? And yet that is still not the main reason why Christians think, with Sir Walter Scott, that 'there is but one book.'

3. What then (to come to the pith of the matter) do we find in the Bible which we find in no other book? I will answer in one phrase, and then go on to explain it. In the Bible, as nowhere else, we find 'the Word from the Beyond for our human predicament.'

When, in the time of disaster or bereavement, men and women turn to the Bible for help, do you think that what they seek is fine writing or even moral light and leading? No, they can get both elsewhere, in the books of many a clever or wise man of this world. Perplexed by the burden and mystery of things, beset behind and before by grief and guilt, they want something that goes further and deeper than that. They want an assurance that in all their sin and suffering the great Being who made all things really and veritably cares about it all—nay more, that He has done something about it, something worthy of a God. And it is just this assurance, this Word from the Beyond, that the Bible claims to give.

If you ask me to put that Word in one sentence, I cannot do better than quote Jn 3^{16}: 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.'

This is the Word from the Beyond for our human predicament. Not only that there is a God, not only that He cares; but that once in history He came down among us as a man, took upon Himself the homespun of our human nature, to show us what He is like, and then died like a man to bind us to Himself for ever.

Here is the climax of the story the Bible has to tell; the coming of God in Christ into our fallen world for us men and for our salvation. All leads up to this; all finds its fulfilment there. For the Bible is the record of a progressive revelation. It tells how God revealed Himself to men, not all at once but bit by bit as they were able to receive it. The story of that revelation goes away back to the call by God of a man named Abraham; it goes on to tell how God chose a special people to reveal Himself to them, that they in turn might make Him known to all men; how He spoke to them through certain gifted men called prophets; how He disciplined and trained them, by prosperity and disaster, through many centuries; and how, when the right time came, God, instead of revealing Himself in this piecemeal way, made a perfect revelation of Himself in one who was His only Son.

The claim of the Bible, then, is that in Christ we have the master-clue to the meaning of the world—that behind it is not a fate but a Father; that His will is that men should live in fellowship with Him, both here and hereafter; and that He has given His Son to make all this possible.

Of course, it is a stupendous claim to make: so stupendous that some men simply can't believe it. But there are others—hundreds of millions of them, all over the world—who do believe it. And not only believe it, but act on it, and shape their lives by it. The solution of the riddle of the world, not in Karl Marx and *Das Kapital*, but in Jesus Christ and the Bible—that is the Christian claim. That is the ultimate reason why we must read the Bible.

Before you put that claim aside as ridiculous or as too good to be true, remember that it comes to us signed and countersigned by a man called Jesus of Nazareth. Do you think it likely that He was wrong? O consider it yet again.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

An Appeal to the Heroic

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., EDINBURGH

'For I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake.'—Ac 9^{16}.

This approach to a distinguished man who had but recently professed his intention to follow Jesus Christ some may find a little startling. Even though it were true that in a short time he would be receiving the punishment he himself had been unfeelingly meting out, was it wise to hint at such a possibility before the man had set foot upon the Christian highway?

God could easily have instructed Ananias to show Saul how great he would some day be, or how great things he would be privileged to accomplish, but He chose to instruct Ananias to show him how great things he must suffer; he must know the worst as well as the best, the burdens he would have to carry as well as the benefits he would be privileged to share, the sorrow he would have to endure as well as the joy which he would experience. Had this man, for all his distinction, the qualities which belong inalienably to heroes? If he had, he would respond to an invitation to risk and to adventure and to suffering. If he hadn't, then he wouldn't respond, and, in that case, was better out of the ranks he was proposing to join.

The risk—if risk it was in mentioning suffering so soon—was fully justified. Something in Saul leapt at the life that was offered him, something that might well have been repelled by an offer of something easy and soft and comfortable, and, from that moment until the end, he was God's man.

1. It is worth recalling that the approach made to Saul at this critical hour of his life was precisely the approach made by Jesus to all who aspired to be His disciples.

Many, says the New Testament, were desirous of being enrolled in His company, some whose names and influence other leaders would have been glad to use if only to impress others with the type they were capable of attracting. But Jesus did not accept every man. They might be wealthy, like the rich young ruler, or in a position of influence as Nicodemus was, but no man was safe to consider his wealth or his position a certain passport to His fellowship. They might offer their loyalty in return for some personal advancement, or in the hope of sharing something of the glory of His Kingdom when it came, but they discovered that this Master was prepared to have them, not on their terms, but on His. With ruthless and consistent honesty He set forth what following Him must mean and, as He spoke, it may be that some who were already numbered among His followers felt that He was honest to a fault, and who, perhaps, when some of the aspirant followers turned away, regretted their loss to the Christian cause. If only their Master would lower His standards just a little and be a trifle more accommodating, would accept men on terms less arduous than He constantly proposed. But no! He kept inflexibly to His chosen approach to men, partly because He wanted them to know from the outset the worst as well as the best, the burdens they would have to carry as well as the benefits they would be privileged to share, and partly because only men who had within them the stuff of which heroes are made were of any value to Him.

The words which Garibaldi uttered at a critical hour in his life, in which he offered men only blood and tears and toil and sweat, have been frequently quoted, and many have commented on that distinguished leader's audacity in asking for men's loyalty upon such terms. But long before Garibaldi lived, the greatest Leader of men did not hide what must befall all who chose to align themselves with Him and, it falls to be recorded, in Jesus' case as well as in Garibaldi's, that some who might have been repelled by something easy and comfortable responded to the life of adventure to which He called them.

2. How many within our Christian ranks have forgotten this ruthless honesty of Jesus? How many who know Jesus only at second-hand, to whom Christianity has been misrepresented as an appeal to softness, find His appeal to the heroic in man something novel?

Some within the Christian Church complain that Jesus' service has been something of a disappointment, that following Him has, to their surprise, involved them in difficulties and misunderstandings and misrepresentations; and whereas they were wont to take an active part in every Christian enterprise now they are only spectators thankful to be out of a service in which one is liable to receive many an undeserved knock. In common honesty, one must remind such of the ruthless honesty of Jesus who on no occasion suggested that, in His service, men would be excused from difficulties and misunderstandings and misrepresentations. 'I will shew him,' said God, 'how great things he must suffer for my name's sake.' And Paul, as God foretold, did suffer, sometimes, it must be said, at the hands of colleagues who, because they were human and fallible as all men are, made their mistakes.

But if some who are within the Christian Church

must be reminded of the ruthless honesty of Jesus, some who are outwith the Church must be reminded of Jesus Christ's appeal to the heroic in men. Those of us who know anything of Jesus Christ at first-hand and something of the men and women whom He has mastered and made His disciples get rather tired of some playwrights' conception of the average follower of Jesus—an anæmic curate who sips cups of tea and has a willing ear for all kinds of trivialities and gossip. 'While as a Christian minister,' wrote Dr. Fosdick, 'I feel free to criticise Christianity because it often is interpreted so that it brings out softness, there are times when, hearing that criticism from another source, it awakens my ire. Here is a youth with a sweet face and a fair cheek, upon whose innocent chin the dew of his first beard is not yet evident, and who has probably never done anything much more daring than play tennis, who says, Christianity appeals to softness; the weak need it; the strong do not. To which I answer, Since when has Christianity appealed to softness? Were Augustine and Martin Luther soft? Were the great pioneers and missionaries of the faith from David Livingstone to Wilfred Grenfell, or social reformers like Shaftesbury, soft? Say what you will about Christianity, yet when you know its history, the sacrifices it has inspired, the far-flung battle line it holds to-day across the world, the thing you cannot say is that it appeals to softness. At its best it has appealed, as it did at first, to the spirit of adventure.'

3. There may be some who feel, however, after all this has been said about Jesus' ruthless honesty and His appeal to the heroic, that too much has been said and are persuaded that we shall never get disciples on such terms.

For themselves, perhaps, they cannot respond to such a life. It makes demands they cannot fulfil and asks a loyalty they are not prepared to give. But is that true of every man? Jesus thought not. And God thought not when He instructed Ananias as He did. Some men and women want to live, not sheltered lives, but serviceable lives, to think, not of trivialities, but of the problems which tease and trouble the minds of thinking men, to mould the world and not to be moulded by the world, to take their share of hardship and not to evade it. If we are of that company and if we have never considered Jesus capable of offering us the risk and the danger and the difficulty we desire, it is to us He makes His appeal. There are men and women to be redeemed from what the New Testament calls sin, there are evils to be eradicated from our human society, there are other lands to be won for truth and honour and righteousness. Such tasks may, almost certainly will, involve disappointment and suffering, but, in spite of that, can we think of any tasks more worthy of the consecration of our gifts and the devotion of our lives?

Heroism did not die with Paul. We have got what Paul had—the qualities of which heroes are made. We have got what he had—a desire to wear out and not to rust out. That being so, why shouldn't we follow in his train at this hour of the world's life when Jesus Christ has an opportunity of accomplishing things which will redound to His glory and be for the eternal good of all mankind. Let those of us who turned back because we suffered disappointment think afresh of Jesus' ruthless honesty, and let those of us who have never fully served Him think of His appeal to the heroic, and, together, let us lay all our gifts gladly and willingly on the altar of His service 'who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

Fourth Sunday in Advent

The Significance of Christ's Birth

By the Reverend John L. Riach, B.D., Edinburgh

'Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.'—Mt 1^{21}.

'A light to lighten the Gentiles.'—Lk 2^{32}.

'And the Word was made flesh.'—Jn 1^{14}.

If a study of the Four Gospels be made, it will be discovered that the original of them, Mark, has no account of Jesus' birth. Biblical scholars have suggested that either Mark was unaware of the birth narratives, or these stories were so well known that there was no need for the Evangelist to repeat them to the Roman Christians for whom he was writing, especially in a day of parchment scarcity. When we turn to the other three Gospels, however, we discover not only different accounts of Jesus' birth, but each Evangelist interprets its significance in his own way.

1. When we cast our eye over Matthew's account of the birth story we find that he traces the ancestry of Jesus back to Abraham; gives an account of how Joseph had the Divine origin of the child revealed to him; holds us spellbound with his tale of the Wise Men bringing their costly treasures and outwitting the crafty Herod. When Matthew asks himself the significance of this Child's appearance, which he details at such length, he gives answer in the words, 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.' Had Jesus never been born, the world would not know what deliverance from evil is.

The prophets of the Old Testament make it abundantly clear that one of the ways God speaks to men is through the events of history. If that be so, then what is the Almighty One seeking to proclaim to our generation through the cataclysmic events of our time? Why has an atheistical creed like Communism been permitted to master half the world in the twinkling of an eye and to threaten the other half? The finest Christian thinkers have no doubt what part of the answer, at least, is. God is calling upon men to see the terribleness of human evil and to be delivered from it. Browning avers that when Lazarus was raised from the dead by Jesus he was an entirely different man. When the legions of Rome swooped down on Jerusalem to destroy it, and folk panicked, Lazarus kept calm and cared nothing if he lost all. The one thing that he was anxious about was that neither he nor his children should do anything wrong in that hour of crisis. He had been on the other side of death and seen sin from God's angle. Never could he forget that searing vision of the sheer gravity of human evil, and that man's paramount need is to be saved from it. God may not be revealing this truth to us by raising us from the grave like Lazarus, but He is seeking to bring it home to us through the events of our time. It is plain for all to see that our present plight is due to the sinfulness of men and that there is no escape except by men having their devilishness crushed in the most radical manner. Now the claim of Matthew is that there is no deliverance of men from their sins except through Jesus Christ. To him, this is the supreme significance of His appearance on the human scene. Matthew was writing his Gospel specifically for Jews. Pious Jews believed in the forgiveness of God and sought it; but for them forgiveness was purely juridical. Recently, a rascally Jew, guilty of a series of corruptions, escaped from the country. In his absence, a fellow Jew whom he had swindled out of a large sum of money brought an action against him. The judge found in the plaintiff's favour and awarded heavy damages. The defrauded man had won a legal verdict but, since the defendant was out of reach of the Law, he received not a penny. Before Christ was born this was the kind of situation in which the Jews found themselves. They turned to God with their sins and He spoke His word of pardon, but the power to shatter the evil thing they sought forgiveness for was not imparted to them. They were freed from sin's guilt but not from its power. When Jesus arrived in this world all was completely changed. To Matthew, this was the most momentous tidings which could be conveyed to the Jews he was writing for; this was the supreme significance of Jesus' birth.

2. Turn to Luke, and we find he begins his birth narrative with one of the greatest of all Christian hymns—The Magnificat. He continues with the journey to Bethlehem for the census, the birth in the lowly stable, the coming of the shepherds to pay homage. He brings his story to an end with the Child being taken to the Temple where it is received by old Simeon. When Luke asks himself the significance of Jesus' birth, which he has discussed with touching beauty, he makes answer in the immortal 'Nunc Dimittis' of Simeon, namely, that this wonder Child was given as 'a light to lighten the Gentiles.' He had come to give a faith which would satisfy the intellectuals of the world.

In the opinion of McNeile Dixon, David Hume is the most brilliant mind Scotland has produced. If ever a man was born under a sceptical star it was he. Rarely did he trouble the church with his presence. Yet, one day in London a friend met him hurrying along to hear George Whitefield preach. 'Surely you do not believe what Whitefield is preaching,' said his friend in surprise. 'No,' replied Hume, 'but he does!' And on he rushed. This is the dilemma in which the clever of this earth find themselves. They tend to make a god of reason and trust only things which can be proved by logic. Along came the higher religions of the world claiming to be founded not on the speculations of men but on revelations from God. Their tenets can be shown to be reasonable, yet they defy complete logical proof. Thus, the intellectuals shy at the claims of religion and find it difficult to accept them. Nevertheless, they sense that reason has its grave limitations, and, like Hume, they find a religious instinct within them calling for a faith of some kind to satisfy it. But to what religion are they to turn? Which of the worthier faiths can meet the demands of the most exacting intellectuals who abound in our age, and who will be more abundant in years to come? Dean Inge maintains that the vast percentage of men who have attained eminence in all professions were born either in English vicarages or Scottish manses. He could have gone further. He could have shown that from its inception to the present day the Christian Church can boast more men of brilliant intellect in its membership than any other institution. What persuaded these men to be enthusiastic Christians was not the stifling of their reason. They risked taking the steps of faith, and in so doing, something happened to reason. It was flashed to them with overwhelming conviction that the mysteries of Christianity are true, and that they can stand the most searching intellectual scrutiny. If intellectuals, like ordinary mortals, must have a religion as a matter of life and death, Christianity is the

only one which can satisfy the needs of their restless minds. To Luke, this was the significance of Jesus coming into the world. Unlike the other Gospel writers, Luke was a Greek. He knew the brilliant intellectual achievements of his race. He was aware it could boast Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle among its sons. He was conversant with his fellow-countrymen's veneration of reason, and how they were wandering about in search of a faith because the religions of their ancestors had proved intellectually bankrupt. With the advent of Jesus Christ, Luke saw a new day for the Greek world. Here was One with a faith to satisfy the intellectual demands of Greece and of all lands. This Nazarene was indeed a light to lighten the Gentiles who sat in spiritual darkness. That was the significance of the birth at Bethlehem to him.

3. When we divert our attention to John, we discover no entrancing birth narratives of wise men or shepherds in his Gospel. He begins further back in the dim mists of antiquity. He describes the pre-existence of Christ and His life with God from all eternity. Then, suddenly and dramatically, he mentions Jesus' coming into the world. As with the other Evangelists, when we ask the significance of Christ's birth to John, he answers that it lies in the fact that 'the Word was made flesh': that in Jesus of Nazareth men are confronted with God Himself.

Sixty years ago a man was charged with cheating at cards. The case caused a scandal because the Prince of Wales of that day was involved. Patrick Hastings avers that it is quite impossible for any one to-day to tell if the accused man were guilty or not merely from reading the evidence given at the trial. To know the truth, one would have required to have seen the man in the witness-box. There is all the difference in the world between hearing about a person and being confronted by the person. If that be so of men, how much more true is it of God. For one thing, religion ceases to be 'a dry-eyed duty' and thrills men to the marrow only when they meet God face to face, and never by any description of Him however minute and accurate. For another, there is a life, which can only be described as eternal, imparted to a man when he is confronted by God. What is more, there is a spiritual hunger in the soul of man which will not be satisfied with all the definitions of God the theologians care to supply, but only by encountering God Himself. And, finally, there is a knowledge of God gleaned only through meeting God as He is, and which cannot be given to us in words by the ablest writers; for, did not Eckhardt say, 'When we speak of God we do but stammer'? With penetrating insight John saw this was the unique thing about Jesus of Nazareth. Unlike any prophet who was before Him or after Him, He did not tell men about God. He confronted men with God Himself in His own Person so that men were compelled to say, 'My Lord and my God.' When brought face to face with Jesus Christ, this is what He still does to men. He makes them feel that in Him the Word is indeed made flesh; and to John, that is the whole significance of Jesus' appearance in this world.

In a Nativity play at Windsor Castle the present Queen had a part to play. She had to kneel at the manger and worship the Holy Child. Those privileged to look on thought she was not acting but was really pouring out her adoration to Jesus Christ. Even though we may not be able to rise to it every day, Christmas is a time when each of us should be capable of self-forgetting worship of Christ. If we wish to know why, we shall find the reasons in the birth narratives of Matthew, Luke, and John.

Recent Foreign Theology

The Dead Sea Scrolls. Interest in the recently found Hebrew Scrolls continues unabated, and three studies published in French have appeared in rapid succession. G. Lambert, who has published a series of articles in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, has published a full translation of the Manual of Discipline,[1] the full Hebrew text of which was published by the American Schools in 1951.[2] The first full translation of this text to appear was made by J. van der Ploeg, and appeared in the pages of *Bibliotheca Orientalis*,[3] while W. H. Brownlee has published a translation in English.[4]

[1] *Le Manuel de Discipline du Désert de Juda : Étude Historique et Traduction Intégrale.* (Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. II, Fasc. 23) [1951]. Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges and Paris.

[2] *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery.* II. Fascicle 2 : *Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*, edited by M. Burrows with the assistance of J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee.

[3] Vol. viii. [1951] 113–126.

[4] *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* [1951]. (Supplementary Studies 10–12 of Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.)

Lambert's study contains a long Introduction, and, like Brownlee's, is accompanied by valuable notes. The author does not pronounce judgment on the vexed question of the date of the Scrolls, and thinks it is premature to identify the sect from which they came. A further annotated translation of this text together with a translation of the Habakkuk Commentary has been published by H. E. del Medico.[1] To compare the four translations of the Manual of Discipline is to realize how many difficulties are still unsolved. Unlike Lambert, del Medico attempts to define the age of composition of the texts. He identifies the Sons of Zadok of our texts with the followers of Judas of Galilee, who belongs to the beginning of the Christian era, and holds that they took their name from Rabbi Zadok, who instigated a revolt at that time. He attributes our texts, however, to the period following the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and maintains that the Sons of Zadok were first organized as a secret sect after A.D. 80. He even finds a reference to the eruption of Vesuvius in the texts. All of this is highly questionable, and even more so is del Medico's analysis of the Manual of Discipline into material from a number of separate sources. Much valuable information is contained in his detailed notes, however, and he prefaces his work with a useful summary of Jewish History from about 200 B.C. to the time of Bar Cochba's revolt.

The third of the French works referred to above is by G. Vermès,[2] and consists of a study of all that is known of the Community of the New Covenant from which the newly found Scrolls, and also the Zadokite work, which was found in the Cairo Geniza and first published by S. Schechter more than forty years ago,[3] issued. Various attempts to identify the sect were made after Schechter's texts were published, and since the Dead Sea Scrolls came to light interest in this question has been renewed. Vermès attacks the question of the date of our texts, and like del Medico, he ascribes them to a date after the Fall of Jerusalem and finds the events of that period reflected in them. In the Habakkuk Commentary he finds the idea of a new Deluge, this time of fire, and says this concept is first attested in the first century A.D. Since he declares it to be of Iranian origin, however, there is no reason why it could not have reached Palestine much earlier. In an appendix to the work of Vermès, J. Coppens, whose writings are frequently referred to in ' Recent Foreign Theology,' reviews recent discussion of the Scrolls and gives general approval to the views of Vermès, while criticising those of some other scholars.

That so many different views are advanced is disconcerting for those who want quick and assured results, but it is of the utmost importance that free discussion should be encouraged, and that final conclusions should be reached with caution.[4] On any showing the Scrolls are of great importance, and they will add much to our knowledge of Jewish apocalyptic circles.

The Servant Songs. Professor Johannes Lindblom, of Lund, is of the opinion that the great variety of solutions of the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah is evidence that the problem has been wrongly approached. He has therefore written a short monograph in which he essays a new approach.[5] He maintains that the question Who was the Servant ? is a wrong one, and that we should seek first to establish the literary character of the Songs. These he finds to be allegories closely related to their context, and in the context he finds the interpretations of the allegories. Thus Is 42^{1-4} is the first Song, while 42^{5-9} is the interpretation, showing that the Servant stands for Israel. The details of the allegory are not to be pressed, however, but belong to the form in which it is cast. Similarly Is 49^{1-6} is the second Song, describing the real experience of the prophet himself, yet presented as an allegory of the Servant and interpreted in 49^{7}. The third Song again, Is 50^{4-9}, describes the experience of the prophet, but its interpretation is given in $50^{10f.}$. In the case of the fourth Song he finds the interpretation in

[1] *Deux Manuscrits Hébreux de la Mer Morte : Essai de Traduction du ' Manuel de Discipline ' et du ' Commentaire d'Habbakuk ' avec Notes et Commentaires* [1951]. Geuthner, Paris.

[2] *La Communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance* (Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. II, Fasc. 22) [1951].

[3] *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. i. : *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* [1910].

[4] As is well known some writers have argued for a second century B.C. date for the origin of these texts, and A. Dupont-Sommer assigns them to the middle of the first century B.C. (cf. *Aperçus Préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* [1950]). J. L. Teicher has argued for an Ebionite origin in the first century A.D., in *Journal of Jewish Studies*, ii. Nos. 2 and 3 [1951], and P. Kahle for a somewhat later date and, following Dupont-Sommer, an Essene origin (cf. *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* [1951], and *Vetus Testamentum*, i. [1951] 38–48). In the most recent monograph in English G. R. Driver argues for caution in dating, and for the possibility of a later date still (cf. *The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* [1951]), while in a series of articles in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* S. Zeitlin and P. R. Weis have argued for a mediaeval origin.

[5] *The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah : A New Attempt to Solve an Old Problem* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 47, Nr. 5) [1951]. Gleerup, Lund.

Is 52^{13}–53^{1}, preceding the allegory in 53^{2-12}. Here the figure described in the allegory is a fictitious symbolic figure, but still standing for the nation Israel. Professor Lindblom rejects the oscillating view associated with Wheeler Robinson's 'corporate personality' concept, and maintains that in all cases the allegorical Servant is to be interpreted as a figure for Israel.

The monograph also offers an analysis of the ideas of Deutero-Isaiah into missionary revelations and triumphal revelations, with many ideas common to the two groups, and shows the kinship of the Servant Songs with the message of the prophet as a whole. Professor Lindblom offers an excellent examination of the use of figurative language in Deutero-Isaiah. Were it only for this section the book would be worth buying, for it offers a new and first-class literary study of the prophecies. A further chapter on Eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah argues that it is wiser not to speak of the prophet's eschatology, but rather of his view of the future. While it is doubtful if this will be found to dispose finally of the problem of the Servant, any more than preceding studies, it may be said that it is valuable and suggestive, and particularly to be commended for its relation of the songs to their context.

The Vulgate Bible. The great Benedictine edition of the Vulgate text of the Bible is proceeding with great rapidity since the War. The volume containing Chronicles appeared in 1948, that containing Ezra, 1 Esdras, Tobit and Judith in 1950, and now the volume containing Esther and Job has been issued.[1] The superb technical production of the volumes is matched by the diligence and care of the editors, whose effort to recover the original text of Jerome, and whose full critical apparatus, make their work indispensable for the use of the Vulgate for text-critical purposes. When the recently started Beuron edition of the Old Latin text [2] is completed the student will be singularly well supplied for the Latin versions, and will be even more conscious than he now is of the poverty of his tools for dealing with the Syriac text.

It should be added that Jerome's prefaces to the books of Esther and Job are printed in the new Vulgate, and the editors have a short Introduction in which the manuscripts on which they have relied for these books, in addition to those used for the preceding books, are recorded.

H. H. Rowley

The University, Manchester

---

[1] *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem iussu Pii PP. XII cura et studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti edita*, IX. *Libri Hester et Iob ex interpretatione Sancti Hieronymi* [1951]. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Rome.

[2] So far only the parts listing the signs employed and part of the book of Genesis have appeared, under the title *Vetus Latina : die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron.*

Entre Nous

Worship in the Day School : 4. The Conduct of Worship

The School Assembly is not just an opening ceremony, a kind of spiritual kick-off for the day, otherwise unrelated to the affairs of the school. It should be the most realistic preparation for the day's activities, setting the tone, so to speak, of all that follows, closely integrated with the whole of school life. All the most vital concerns and interests of the school should find their focus in the morning Assembly. It is there that the *ethos* of the school should have its main source of inspiration. It should be nothing less than the school dedicating itself to God.

A School Assembly should consist at least of the following items : a quiet *act of recollection*, including a short prayer of preparation or worship ; a *hymn* ; a short *reading* (or *talk*) ; and two or three brief *prayers*. That is the smallest frame work into which anything worthwhile can be fitted ; but, where nothing more is possible, even such a brief daily act, over a period of time, will afford opportunities for every aspect of prayer. Anything less than that would, with children, probably be too cursory and unimpressive to be worth troubling about.

The art of conducting worship follows the same general principles, whether in church or in school. Most of them are comprised under the two headings, *Reverence* and *Interest*.

Reverence concerns personal demeanour. The most important thing is that the leader should conduct himself with composure and dignity, and that he should be more concerned to say his own prayers than to see that the children are saying theirs. This will have its due effect on his whole bearing, the tone of his voice, the restraint of

gesture, and so on. The demeanour of the staff during School Assembly is also an important factor in promoting or destroying an atmosphere of reverence. The mood of adults imparts itself to children like a contagion.

A spirit of reverence may be induced by a careful use of silence. Always begin an act of worship with a brief guided silence ('Our Lord Jesus Christ is with us. . . . Let us think of Him for a few moments in silence'), followed by a prayer of worship or preparation. Such a silence is not only devotional but disciplinary. It is worth more than any number of sharp and noisy commands. Use silence too at other strategic parts of the service—after the reading, after biddings suggesting private acts of prayer, after the blessing. Train younger children unostentatiously to put their hands together and close their eyes. Let the whole conduct of the service be quiet, unhurried, and full of opportunities for private prayer and thought. Again, see that the children are reasonably comfortable. This has a strong bearing on reverence. Don't let them sit or kneel too long on hard floors. Let them vary their position fairly often. In churches children are often compelled to kneel down in pews or at chairs which are too big for them. Standing with bowed head is a perfectly good and traditional attitude for worship.

Reverence includes that leisureliness and composure which allows people time to collect and concentrate their thoughts. Don't gabble prayers (or let children do so). Don't turn the pages in search of the next prayer while you are still saying the current one! Don't say, 'Let us pray for peace'—and then plunge straight into the prayer on the same breath. Leave the children time to catch up with you and focus their attention. These simple rules sound trite and obvious, but they are broken every day in hundreds of schools and churches.

Above all, avoid breaking in on the atmosphere of worship with anything that is bound to strike a discordant note. This is the most commonly broken rule of all. Leave all notices and acts of discipline till the service is over. If the children are gabbling the Lord's Prayer or dragging the hymns, resist the temptation to stop in the middle of the service to say so! Read the lecture afterwards. Let the Assembly proceed from start to finish on a level of uninterrupted worship, beginning and ending with silence.

The other guiding principle in leading worship is *Interest*. The Church in her wisdom has devised buildings and liturgies which, by their combined assault, both on the spirit and on the senses, engage interest at every point. This should be our model in school worship. It should attract and sustain the children's interest. There is no virtue in boredom. As we saw in the previous article, this will be best achieved by providing every opportunity for active participation in the service itself. The daily concerns and interests of the children's life should be reflected in their morning worship. It will also involve the careful planning of our services, so that their pattern and purpose (aided perhaps by a simple comment here and there) is made clear and interesting to follow. The Church's Year provides all the 'themes' we need. Remember, too, the appeal to the eye. Provide some attractive focus on which the children's wandering gaze may come to rest—a cross or a crucifix, a seasonal picture, a table with flowers or candles; anything that will help them to fix their thoughts on God rather than on the honours board, the swimming trophy, or yesterday's arithmetic!

Occasionally we may let children be responsible for arranging and conducting a whole service, but it is a mistake to make a too frequent practice of this, because in religion (as in everything else) children are learners not instructors, and it is good to let them realize the two thousand years of wisdom and authority which lie behind the honoured traditions of Christian worship.

JOHN G. WILLIAMS
Church of England Schools Council

St. Anselm

Messrs. A. R. Mowbray have issued a new edition of the *Prayers and Meditations of St. Anselm* (3s. net). To us it is not in the same world as, say, the devotions of Lancelot Andrewes. And it is only a selection. But it gets at the heart. Anselm himself tells us how they are to be used. 'They should therefore be read, not amid noise and bustle, but in quiet; they should be not just glanced through quickly, but pondered bit by bit, with pauses for reflection. The reader is, moreover, not obliged to read a whole one at a sitting, he can take at one time only so much as he feels will, with God's help, kindle him to pray, or just as much as he likes.'

Erratum

It is regretted that in the August number, page 343, line 2, column 1, a serious printer's error was not corrected. The line should have read 'Jesus being made sin on their behalf.'

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Study at Home for a DEGREE!

No matter what your position or prospects, a University Degree is a good thing to have. You can obtain a London University Degree without "going into residence": it is necessary only to pass three examinations (in some cases, *two*.) You can prepare for these AT HOME AND IN LEISURE HOURS with the experienced help of Wolsey Hall (founded in 1894). Conducted by a staff of over 100 Graduate Tutors, Wolsey Hall Courses have enabled hundreds of men and women to graduate, thereby increasing their mental abilities, widening their outlook and raising their status.

• **WRITE FOR PROSPECTUS** to C. D. PARKER, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 85,

WOLSEY HALL, OXFORD

"a book of tremendous and challenging implications"

The Theological Basis of CHRISTIAN PACIFISM

by

CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D.

"this book has all the brilliance and 'punch' which we expect from its author"

Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor

5s.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
38 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your PRINTING and PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.

PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS

TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.

LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS

EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

THE SOUL OF A DOG

By F. M. ARCHER. Foreword by Harry Price.

"Mr. F. M. Archer feels certain that the dog must be included in the group of higher animals."—*Church of England Newspaper.* Paper cover, 96 pages, 2*s.* 6*d.* (post 3*d.*)

THE UNKNOWN GOD

By the late Rev. T. V. H. BARBER, M.A.

"I am sure it will be helpful not only to 'Everyman' in the sense of the so-called 'Man-in-the-Street', but also to believers. It is a refreshing and inspiring work."—*Rev. Dr. Levertoff.* Paper cover, 110 pages, 3*s.* 9*d.* (post 3*d.*)

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN PARENTHOOD

Rev. F. BARRIE FLINT

"The particular merit of this book is that while it holds up to parents the highest ideals, it does not disguise how much hard work and self-discipline are needed for their attainment."—*The Rev. Dr. Gilbert Russell, M.A., Ch.B.* Paper cover, 72 pages, 2*s.* 6*d.* (post 3*d.*)

LETTERS TO A COUNTRY PARISH

Rev. F. BARRIE FLINT

"An admirable book. Mr. Flint achieves his object—'To supply a Christian viewpoint on a wide variety of subjects, with a definite challenge to those who have no firm religious convictions'."—*The Church Monthly.* Board cover, 70 pages, 3*s.* (post 3*d.*)

ONE THOUSAND YEARS— THE STORY OF ANCIENT EARLS BARTON

Rev. LOUIS A. EWART, F.R.S.A., F.R.G.S.

"Mr. Ewart has given us a valuable and most readable sketch of the parish through the last thousand years."—*Bishop of Peterborough.* Paper cover, 68 pages, 8 pages illustrations, 5*s.* (post 4*d.*)

CHARLES DICKENS AND THE CHURCH, WITH OTHER ESSAYS

The Rev. CANON SHETTLE, M.A.

"I am personally grateful for a volume which will lie on the table in my study among those few books which I pick up again and again."—*Bishop of Ripon.* Board cover, 147 pages, 5*s.* (post 4*d.*)

THE CHURCHMAN PUBLISHING CO. LTD.
33 Craven Street · London · W.C.2

NOVEMBER THEOLOGY

Our November list contains a number of important theological works which, grouped together, make a rather impressive showing. Here they are listed for you to see.

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Volume 1

by Rudolf Bultmann. The major work of the great Marburg scholar. 25s net

THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

by H. F. D. Sparks, Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham. 13s 6d net

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

by J. G. Davies, Lecturer in Theology at the University of Birmingham. 21s net

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF WORK

by Alan Richardson, Canon of Durham. The first of a new series of ecumenical biblical studies. 5s net

MEET THE GREEK TESTAMENT

Two essays and a dialogue intended for those who have little or no Greek

by Adam Fox, Canon of Westminster. 8s 6d net

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM 4s net

THE CHURCH UNDER COMMUNISM 5s net

The two famous Reports on Communism prepared by a Commission of the Church of Scotland.

Any who would like a full list of our Autumn and Winter publications are invited to write to

SCM PRESS

56 Bloomsbury Street London WC1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.* *Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*